DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 664 EC 170 443

TITLE	Hearing on the Reauthorization of the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1984. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Eighth Congress, First Session on H.R. 3435, To Revise and Extend the Education of the Handicapped Act, and For Other Purposes.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	14 Jul 83
NOTE	67p.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; Organizations (Groups); Special Education
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 98th

ABSTRACT

The proceedings are presented from a 1983 congressional hearing on the reauthorization of the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendment of 1984. The first section presents H.R. 3435 which includes new features on such topics as expansion of the State Implementation Grant program, emphasis on technical assistance in the education of deaf-blind students, and establishment of the National Advisory Committee on the Education of Handicapped Children. Also presented are statements of federal officials and statements, letters, and supplemental materials from professionals, elected officials, and organizations (such as United Cerebral Palsy Association, American Speech Language Hearing Association, and the Council for Exceptional Children). (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED248664

HEARING ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1984

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 3435

TO REVISE AND EXTEND THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 14, 1983

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
29-225 O WASHINGTON : 1984

EC170443

ED 282 824

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
FRANK HARRISON, Pennsylvania
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota

JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
RON PACKARD, California
HOWARD C. NIELSON, Utah
ROD CHANDLER, Washington

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

GEORGE MILLER, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky
(Ex Officio)

STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
(Ex Officio)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, D.C., on July 14, 1983	1
Text of H.R. 3435	2
Statement of:	
Chelimsky, Dr. Eleanor, Director, Institute for Program Evaluation, U.S. General Accounting Office, accompanied by Lois-Ellin Danta	27
McNulty, Dr. Brian, supervisor of special education and early childhood State coordinator, Colorado Department of Education and Dr. Philip Jones, professor and coordinator, administration and supervision of special education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, a panel of witnesses	32
Will, Madeleine, Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education, accompanied by Edward Sontag, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education	13
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.:	
Chelimsky, Eleanor, Director, Institute for Program Evaluation, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C., prepared statement of	23
Jones, Philip R., Ed. D., professor and coordinator, administration and supervision of special education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Va., prepared statement of	34
McNulty, Dr. Brian, supervisor of special education and early childhood, State coordinator, Colorado Department of Education, Denver, Colo., prepared statement of	31
Murphy, Hon. Austin J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania and chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education, opening statement of	1
Roy, Kathleen M., policy associate, United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc., Washington, D.C., prepared statement of	45
The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, prepared statement of	58
The Conference of Educational Administrators Serving the Deaf, Inc. [CEASD] and the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf (CAID], prepared statement of	56
Weintraub, Frederick J., assistant executive director, department of governmental relations, the Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, Va., prepared statement of	49
Will, Madeleine C., Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, prepared statement of	16

HEARING ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1984, H.R. 3435

THURSDAY, JULY 14, 1983

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., in room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Austin J. Murphy (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Murphy, Williams, and Bartlett.

Also present: Cheryl Kinsey, professional staff member; Tanya Rahall, staff assistant; Pat Morrissey, legislative associate; and Mary Jane Fiske, senior legislative associate.

Mr. MURPHY. Good morning. The hearing will come to order. My preceding remarks I will just insert into the record.

[The opening statement of Chairman Murphy follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF AUSTIN J. MURPHY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA AND CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

The hearing will now come to order.

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome all of the witnesses here today as the Subcommittee on Select Education examines H.R. 3435, a bill to reauthorize the discretionary programs under the Education of the Handicapped Act through fiscal year 1987.

Many of you are probably most familiar with Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act, more commonly known as Public Law 94-142 or the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. This is the state formula grants portion of the Act and it has a permament authorization. The discretionary programs we are examining today are a critical source of support to the educational and related services provided to nearly 4 million handicapped children under Public Law 94-142. They provide grants to state and local education agencies, other public agencies, private nonprofit organizations and institutions of higher education, to support a variety of research, training and model project activities.

These discretionary programs were originally slated to expire on September 30, 1983, but were automatically extended for one additional year by the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA).

A similar bill, S. 1341, passed the Senate on June 27, 1983. It expands the "Evaluation" section of the Act to require the Secretary of Education to obtain specific data from the states on a regular basis, conduct several evaluation studies and provide this information to Congress in the Annual Report. In addition, this bill authorizes a model demonstration program to determine exemplary practices in meeting the educational needs of secondary, transitional and postsecondary handicapped students which may be replicated across the country.

Both of these initiatives have been incorporated into the H.R. 3435, which contains several new features:

(1) it establishes the National Advisory Committee on the Education of Handicapped Children;

(2) it expands the currently existing State Implementation Grant program under Early Childhood Projects to enable states to receive a grant to plan, develop or implement a comprehensive service delivery system for handicapped children from birth to five years of age;

(3) it emphasizes technical assistance to state and local education agencies in the provision of educational and related services to deaf-blind children with particular attention to transitional programs for deaf-blind youth who are exiting or preparing to exit the educational system;

(4) it recognizes the importance of parent training through a provision requiring the Regional Resource Centers to assist in these efforts *and* through a provision in Part D of the Act requiring the Department of Education to hold a separate grant competition for private nonprofit organizations for this purpose; and

(5) it includes new language under the Research section of the Act which focuses on the development of new and improved techniques for teaching handicapped children.

For our first panel of witnesses today, I am pleased to welcome Mrs. Madeleine Will, Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education, on her first appearance before the Subcommittee.

Mrs. Will, will you please introduce those persons accompanying you and then you may begin.

[Text of H.R. 3435 follows:]

[H.R. 3435, 98th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To revise and extend the Education of the Handicapped Act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1984".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. Section 602 of the Education of the Handicapped Act (hereinafter in this Act referred to as "the Act") is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking out "seriously emotionally disturbed," and inserting in lieu thereof "behaviorally disordered"; and

(B) by inserting "or language" after "speech";

(2) by striking out paragraph (2);

(3) in paragraph (3) by inserting "the Education of" after "Committee on";

(4) in paragraph (6) by amending such paragraph to read as follows:

"(6) The term "State" means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.";

(5) in paragraph (14) by striking out "Health, Education, and Welfare" and inserting in lieu thereof "Education";

(6) in paragraph (16) by inserting "educational" after "unique";

(7) by inserting "(a)" after "602"; and

(8) by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) For purposes of part C of this title, 'handicapped youth' means any handicapped child (as defined in section 602(a)(1)) who—

"(1) is twelve years of age or older; or

"(2) is enrolled in the seventh or higher grade in school.".

DESIGNATION OF THE AGENCY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

SEC. 3. (a) Section 603 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 603. (a) There shall be, within the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services in the Department of Education, an Office of Special Education Pro-

grams which shall be the principal agency in the Department for administering and carrying out this Act and other programs and activities concerning the education and training of the handicapped.

"(b)(1) The office established under subsection (a) shall be headed by a Deputy Assistant Secretary who shall be selected by the Secretary and shall report directly to the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. The position of Deputy Assistant Secretary shall be in grade GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5104 of title 5, United States Code, and shall be a Senior Executive Service position for the purposes of section 3132(a)(2) of such title.

"(2) In addition to such Deputy Assistant Secretary, there shall be established in such office not less than six positions for persons to assist the Deputy Assistant Secretary, including the position of the Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary. Each such position shall be in grade GS-15 of the General Schedule under section 5104 of title 5, United States Code, and shall be a merit pay position for the purposes of section 5401(b)(1) of such title.".

(b) The Act is amended by striking out "Commissioner" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

AMENDMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

SEC. 4. Section 604 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

"SEC. 604. (a) The Secretary shall establish in the Department of Education a National Advisory Committee on the Education of Handicapped Children, consisting of fifteen members, appointed by the Secretary. Not less than five such members shall be parents of handicapped children and the remainder shall be handicapped persons (including students), persons affiliated with education, training, or research programs for the handicapped, and those having demonstrated a commitment to the education of handicapped children.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall review the administration and operation of the programs authorized by this Act and other provisions of law administered by the Secretary with respect to handicapped children (including the effect of such programs in improving the educational attainment of such children) and make recommendations for the improvement of such programs. Such recommendations shall take into consideration experience gained under this and other Federal programs for handicapped children and, to the extent appropriate, experience gained under other public and private programs for handicapped children. The Advisory Committee may make such recommendations to the Secretary as the Committee considers appropriate and shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the Secretary not later than June 30 of each year. The Secretary shall transmit each such report, together with comments and recommendations, to the Congress.

"(c) There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section $200,000 for fiscal year 1985, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years.".

AMENDMENTS WITH RESPECT TO GRANTS FOR THE REMOVAL OF ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS

SEC. 5. Section 607 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"GRANTS FOR THE REMOVAL OF ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS

"SEC. 607. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants and to enter into cooperative agreements with State educational agencies to assist such agencies in making grants to local educational agencies or intermediate educational units to pay part or all of the cost of altering existing buildings and equipment in accordance with standards promulgated under the Act approved August 12, 1968 (Public Law 90-480), relating to architectural barriers.

"(b) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.".

REQUIREMENTS FOR PRESCRIBING REGULATIONS

SEC. 6. The Act is amended by inserting after section 607 the following new section:

"REQUIREMENTS FOR PRESCRIBING REGULATIONS

"SEC. 608. (a) For purposes of complying with section 431(b) of the General Education Provisions Act with respect to regulations promulgated under this Act, the 30 day period under such section shall be 90 days.

"(b) The Secretary may not implement any regulation prescribed pursuant to this Act which would procedurally or substantively lessen the protections provided to handicapped children under this Act, as embodied in regulations in effect on July 20, 1983, (particularly as such protections relate to parental consent to initial evaluation or initial placement in special education, least restrictive environment, related services, timelines, attendance of evaluation personnel at IEP meetings, or qualifications of personnel), except to the extent that such regulation reflects the clear and unequivocal intent of the Congress in legislation.

"(c) The Secretary shall transmit a copy of any regulations promulgated under this Act to the National Advisory Committee on the Education of the Handicapped concurrently with publication in the Federal Register.".

PARTICIPATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS

SEC. 7. Section 613 of the Act is amended by inserting at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) If a State educational agency is prohibited by law from providing for the participation in special programs of handicapped children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools as required by subsection (a)(4), the Secretary shall waive such requirement, and shall arrange for the provision of services to such children through arrangements which shall be subject to the requirements of subsection (a)(4).

"(2) Per pupil expenditures under this part for handicapped children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, to the extent possible, shall equal and may not exceed per pupil expenditures under this part for handicapped children in the public schools of the State educational agency.".

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO EVALUATION

SEC. 8. Section 618 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"EVALUATION

"SEC. 618. (a) The Secretary shall directly or by grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, collect data and conduct studies, investigations, and evaluations—

"(1) to assess progress in the implementation of this Act, the impact, and the effectiveness of State and local efforts to provide free appropriate public education to all handicapped children and youth; and

"(2) to provide Congress with information relevant to policymaking and provide Federal, State, and local educational agencies with information relevant to program management, administration, and effectiveness with respect to such education.

"(b) In carrying out the responsibilities under this section, the Secretary, on at least an annual basis, shall obtain data concerning programs and projects assisted under this Act, and under other Federal laws relating to the education of handicapped children and youth, and such additional information, from State and local educational agencies and other appropriate sources, as is necessary for the implementation of this Act including—

"(1) the number of handicapped children in each State receiving a free appropriate public education (special education and related services) by disability category and by age group (3–5, 6–12, 13–17, and 18–21);

"(2) the number of handicapped children in each State who are participating in regular educational programs, by disability category (consistent with the requirements of secuon 612(5)(B) and section 614(a)(1)(C)(iv)), and the number of handicapped children in separate classes, separate schools or facilities, or public or private residential facilities, or who have been otherwise removed from the regular education environment;

"(3) the number of handicapped children exiting the educational system each year through program completion or otherwise, by disability category and age, and anticipated services for the next year;

"(4) the amount of Federal, State, and local funds expended in each State specifically for special education and related services (which may be based upon a sampling of data from State agencies including State and local educational agencies);

"(5) the number and type of personnel that are employed in the provision of special education and related services to handicapped children, by disability category served, and the estimated number and type of additional personnel by disability category needed to adequately carry out the policy established by this Act; and

"(6) a description of the special education and related services needed to fully implement the Act throughout each State, including estimates of the number of handicapped children within each disability by age group (3-5, 6-12, 13-17, and 18-21) in need of improved services and the type of programs and services in need of improvement.

"(c) The Secretary shall, by grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, provide for evaluation studies to determine the impact of this Act. Each such evaluation shall include recommendations for improvement of the programs under this Act. The Secretary shall, not later than July 1 of each year, submit to the appropriate committees of each House of the Congress and publish in the Federal Register proposed evaluation priorities for review and comment.

"(d)(1) Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall publish and disseminate an annual report on the progress being made toward the provision of a free appropriate public education to all handicapped children and youth. The annual report is to be transmitted to the appropriate committees of each House of Congress and the National Advisory Committee on the Education of Handicapped Children, and published and disseminated in sufficient quantities to the education community at large and to other interested parties.

"(2) The Secretary shall include in each annual report—

"(A) an index and summary of each evaluation activity and results of studies conducted under subsection (c);

"(B) a compilation and analysis of data gathered under subsection (b);

"(C) a description of findings and determinations resulting from monitoring reviews of State implementation of part B of this Act;

"(D) an index of all current projects funded under parts C through F of this Act;

"(E) data reported under sections 621, 622, 623, 627, 634, 641, and 653;

"(F) an analysis and evaluation of the participation of handicapped children and youth in vocational education programs and services;

"(G) an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of procedures undertaken by each State educational agency, local educational agency, and intermediate educational unit to ensure that handicapped children and youth receive special education and related services in the least restrictive environment commensurate with their needs and to improve programs of instruction for handicapped children and youth in day or residential facilities; and

"(H) any recommendations for change in the provisions of this Act or any other Federal law providing support for the education of handicapped children and youth.

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated $3,100,000 for fiscal year 1985, $3,270,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $3,440,000 for fiscal year 1987 to carry out the provisions of this section.".

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO PRESCHOOL INCENTIVE GRANTS

SEC. 9. Section 619(c) of the Act is amended by inserting ", and for providing special education and related services for handicapped children from birth to three years of age" immediately before the period.

AMENDMENTS CONCERNING CENTERS AND SERVICES TO MEET SPECIAL NEEDS OF THE HANDICAPPED

SEC. 10. Part C of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"PART C—CENTERS AND SERVICES TO MEET SPECIAL NEEDS OF THE HANDICAPPED

"REGIONAL RESOURCES CENTERS

"SEC. 621. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, or to enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, institutions of higher education, private nonprofit organizations, State educational agencies, or combinations of such agencies and institutions (which combinations may include one or more local educational agencies) within particular regions of the United States, to pay all or part of the cost of the establishment and operation of regional resource centers. Each regional

resource center shall provide consultation, technical assistance, and training to State educational agencies (including comparable educational agencies and offices within the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior relating to educational programs and services for handicapped children and youth) and through such State agencies to local educational agencies. Each center established or operated under this section shall—

"(1) assist in identifying and solving persistent problems in providing quality special education and related services for handicapped children and youth;

"(2) assist in developing, identifying, and replicating successful programs and practices which will improve special education and related services to handicapped children and youth and their families;

"(3) gather and disseminate information to all State educational agencies within the region and coordinate activities with other centers assisted under this section and other relevant projects conducted by the Department of Education; and

"(4) assist in the improvement of information dissemination to and training activities for professionals and parents of handicapped children.

"(b) In determining whether to approve an application for a project under this section, the Secretary shall consider the need for such a center in the region to be served by the applicant and the capability of the applicant to fulfill the responsibilities under subsection (a).

"(c) Each regional resource center shall report a summary of materials produced or developed and this information shall be included in the annual report to Congress required under section 618.

"SERVICES FOR DEAF-BLIND CHILDREN AND YOUTH

SEC. 622. (a)(1) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, or to enter into cooperative agreements or contracts with, public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, or organizations to assist State educational agencies to—

"(A) assure deaf-blind children and youth a free appropriate public education pursuant to part B of this Act and preliminary transitional services; and

"(B) make available to deaf-blind youth upon attaining the age of twenty-two, programs and services to facilitate their transition from educational to other social services.

"(2) A grant, cooperative agreement, or contract pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) may be made only for programs providing (A) technical assistance to agencies, institutions, or organizations providing educational services to deaf-blind children or youth; (B) preservice or inservice training to paraprofessionals, professionals, or related services personnel preparing to serve, or serving, deaf-blind children or youth; (C) replication of successful innovative approaches to providing educational or related services to deaf-blind children and youth; and (D) facilitation of parental involvement in the education of their deaf-blind children. Such programs may include—

"(i) the diagnosis and educational evaluation of children at risk of being certified deaf-blind;

"(ii) programs of adjustment, education, and orientation for deaf-blind children and youth; and

"(iii) consultative, counseling, and training services for the families of deaf-blind children.

"(3) A grant, cooperative agreement, or contract pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) may be made only for programs providing (A) technical assistance to agencies, institutions, and organizations serving, or proposing to serve, deaf-blind individuals who have attained age twenty-two years; (B) training or inservice training to paraprofessionals or professionals serving, or preparing to serve, such individuals; and (C) assistance in the development or replication of successful innovative approaches to providing rehabilitative, semisupervised, or independent living programs.

"(b) The Secretary is also authorized to enter into a limited number of cooperative agreements or contracts to establish and support regional programs for the provision of technical assistance in the education of deaf-blind children.

"(c) Programs supported under this section shall report annually to the Secretary on the numbers of deaf-blind children and youth, paraprofessionals and professionals, and family members directly serviced by each activity. The Secretary shall summarize this data for submission in the annual report required under section 618.

"EARLY EDUCATION FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

"SEC. 623. (a)(1) The Secretary is authorized to arrange by contract, grant, or cooperative agreement with appropriate public agencies and private nonprofit organiza-

tions, for the development and operation of programs of experimental preschool and early education for handicapped children which the Secretary determines show promise of promoting a comprehensive and strengthened approach to the special problems of such children. Such programs shall include activities and services designed to (1) facilitate the intellectual, emotional, physical, mental, social, and language development of such children; (2) encourage the participation of the parents of such children in the development and operation of any such program; (3) acquaint the community to be served by any such program with the problems and potentialities of such children; and (4) demonstrate services in the least restrictive environment taking advantage, as much as possible, of preschool programs serving nonhandicapped children.

"(2) Programs authorized by this subsection shall be coordinated with similar programs in the schools operated or supported by State or local educational agencies of the community to be served.

"(3) As much as is feasible, such programs shall be geographically dispersed throughout the Nation in urban as well as rural areas.

"(4) No arrangement pursuant to this subsection shall provide for the payment of more than 90 per centum of the total annual costs of development, operation, and evaluation of any program. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including, but not limited to, plant, equipment, and services.

"(b)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary is authorized to make a grant to each State through the State educational agency or other State agency to assist such State agency in planning, developing, and implementing a comprehensive delivery system for the provision of special education and related services to handicapped and other developmentally delayed children from birth through five years of age.

"(2) The Secretary shall make one of the following types of grants (authorized under paragraph (1)) to any State which submits an application which meets the requirements of this subsection:

"(A) PLANNING GRANT.—A grant not to exceed $75,000 per year for a maximum of two years for the purpose of assessing needs within the State and establishing a procedure and design for the development of a State plan which includes parent participation and training of professionals and others.

"(B) DEVELOPMENT GRANT.—A grant not to exceed $125,000 per year for a maximum of three years for the purpose of developing a comprehensive State plan, and gaining approval of this plan from the State Board of Education, the Commissioner of Education, or other designated official of the appropriate State agency.

"(C) IMPLEMENTATION GRANT.—A grant not to exceed $175,000 per year for a maximum of three years for the purpose of implementing and evaluating the comprehensive State plan. A State must apply for annual renewal of such grant.

"(3) Each State educational agency or other State agency desiring to receive a grant under this subsection shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary considers necessary. Each such application shall contain assurances and evidence that:

"(A) The State agency receiving the grant will coordinate with other appropriate State agencies (including the State educational agency) in carrying out the grant.

"(B) The State plan will address the special education and related service needs of all handicapped and developmentally delayed children from birth through five years of age with special emphasis on children who are often not identified and children who are not now served.

"(C) The State plan will be closely coordinated with child-find efforts under section 612(2)(C) and with preschool incentive grant activities under section 619 of this Act.

"(4) The Secretary shall include in the annual report under section 618 of this Act the following:

"(A) The States and State agencies receiving grants under this subsection, the types of grants received, and waivers granted under paragraph (5).

"(B) A description of the activities in each State being undertaken through grants under this subsection.

"(C) Beginning in 1986, a description of the status of special education and related services to handicapped and developmentally delayed children from birth through five years of age (including those receiving services through Head Start, Developmental Disabilities Program, Crippled Children's Services, Mental

Health/Mental Retardation Agency, and State child-development centers and private agencies under contract with local schools).

"(5) Any State participating in a grant program authorized by this subsection may request a waiver from the Secretary of any Federal regulation which interferes with or otherwise obstructs achievement of the objectives of this subsection. The Secretary is authorized to grant such a waiver, or where such regulations are under the jurisdiction of other executive agencies the Secretary may grant such a waiver in conjunction with any appropriate agency head.

"(c)(1) Not more than 30 per centum of the funds made available in any year for the purposes of this section may be used for purposes of subsection (b).

"(2) Not less than 10 per centum of the funds made available in any year for the purposes of subsection (b) shall be available for the provision of training and technical assistance to States preparing to receive or receiving grants under this section.

"RESEARCH, INNOVATION, TRAINING, AND DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES IN CONNECTION WITH CENTERS AND SERVICES FOR THE HANDICAPPED

"SEC. 624. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, or to enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with such organizations or institutions, as are determined by the Secretary to be appropriate, consistent with the purposes of this part, for—

"(1) research to identify and meet the full range of special needs of handicapped children and youth;

"(2) the development or demonstration of new, or improvements in existing, methods, approaches, or techniques which would contribute to the adjustment and education of handicapped children and youth;

"(3) training of personnel for programs specifically designed for handicapped children (including payment of stipends for trainees and allowances for travel and other expenses for trainees and their dependents); and

"(4) dissemination of materials and information about practices found effective in working with such children and youth.

"(b) In making grants and contracts under this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the activities funded under such grants and contracts will be coordinated with similar activities funded from grants and contracts under other sections of this Act.

"(c) In carrying out the provisions of this section the Secretary is authorized to address the needs of those with handicapping conditions of the greatest degree of severity.

"POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 625. (a)(1) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to or enter into contracts with State educational agencies, institutions of higher education, junior and community colleges, vocational and technical institutions, and other appropriate nonprofit educational agencies for the development, operation, evaluation, and dissemination of specially designed model programs of postsecondary, vocational, technical, continuing, or adult education for handicapped individuals.

"(2) In making grants or contracts on a competitive basis under this section, the Secretary shall give consideration to four regional centers for the deaf and to model programs for individuals with handicapping conditions other than deafness—

"(A) for developing and adapting programs of postsecondary, vocational, technical, continuing, or adult education to meet the special needs of handicapped individuals; and

"(B) for programs that coordinate, facilitate, and encourage education of handicapped individuals with their nonhandicapped peers.

"(3) Of the sums made available for programs under this section, not less than $2,000,000 shall first be available for the four regional centers for the deaf.

"(b) For the purposes of this section the term 'handicapped individuals' means individuals who are mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech or language impaired, hard of hearing, deaf, speech or language impaired, visually handicapped, behaviorally disordered, orthopedically impaired, or other health impaired individuals, or individuals with specific learning disabilities who by reason thereof require special education and related services.

"SECONDARY EDUCATION AND TRANSITIONAL SERVICES FOR HANDICAPPED YOUTH

"SEC. 626. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts with, institutions of higher education, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, or other appropriate public and private nonprofit institutions or

agencies (including the State job training coordinating councils and service delivery area administrative entities established under the Job Training Partnership Act (Public Law 97-300)) to—

"(1) strengthen and coordinate education, training, and related services for handicapped youth to assist in the transitional process to postsecondary education, vocational training, competitive employment, continuing education, or adult service; and

"(2) stimulate the improvement and development of programs for secondary special education.

"(b) Projects assisted under this section may include—

"(1) developing strategies and techniques for transition to independent living, vocational training, postsecondary education, and competitive employment for handicapped youth;

"(2) establishing demonstration models for services and programs which emphasize vocational training, transitional services, and placement for handicapped youth;

"(3) conducting demographic studies which provide information on the numbers, age levels, types of handicapping conditions, and services required for handicapped youth in need of transitional programs;

"(4) specially designed vocational programs to increase the potential for competitive employment for handicapped youth;

"(5) research and development projects for exemplary service delivery models and the replication and dissemination of successful models;

"(6) initiating collaborative models between educational agencies and adult service agencies, including vocational rehabilitation, mental health, mental retardation, public employment, and employers, which facilitate the planning and developing of transitional services for handicapped youth to postsecondary education, vocational training, employment, continuing education, and adult services;

"(7) developing appropriate procedures for evaluating vocational training, placement, and transitional services for handicapped youth;

"(8) specially designed programs to provide more effective secondary school instruction in interaction of handicapped youth with nondisabled students, development of positive self-image, improvement of social, communication, and independent living skills, and utilization of innovative and exemplary educational approaches to the needs of secondary school-level students; and

"(9) establishing demonstration and model programs which offer promise of improving secondary school education for handicapped youth, including increasing successful participation in academic, social, cultural, athletic, community, and other aspects of the total school program, as well as activities related to the school program which encourage the involvement of community resources (such as business, industry, labor, and cultural and civic groups) in expanding and enriching such educational programs.

"(c) For purposes of subsections (b)(1) and (b)(2), if an applicant is not an educational agency. such applicant shall collaborate with the State educational agency.

"(d) Projects funded under this section shall to the extent appropriate provide for the direct participation of handicapped students and the parents of handicapped students in the planning, development, and implementation of such projects.

"PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

"SEC. 627. The Secretary shall conduct, either directly or by contract, a thorough and continuing evaluation of the effectiveness of each program assisted under this part. Results of the evaluations shall be analyzed and submitted to the appropriate committees of each House of Congress together with the annual report under section 618.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 628. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of section 621, $5,700,000 for fiscal year 1985, $6,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $6,300,000 for fiscal year 1987.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of section 622, $13,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

"(c) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of section 623, $26,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $27,100,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $28,300,000 for fiscal year 1987.

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of subsection (c) of section 624, $300,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $3,200,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $3,300,000 for fiscal year 1987.

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of section 625, $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $5,300,000 for fisal year 1986, and $5,500,000 for fiscal year 1987.

"(f) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of section 626, $6,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $6,330,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $6,660,000 for fiscal year 1987.".

AMENDMENTS CONCERNING TRAINING PERSONNEL FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

SEC. 11. Part D of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"PART D—TRAINING PERSONNEL FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

"GRANTS FOR PERSONNEL TRAINING

"SEC. 631. (a)(1) The Secretary is authorized to make grants, which may include scholarships with necessary stipends and allowances, to institutions of higher education and other appropriate nonprofit agencies to assist them in training personnel for careers in special education including:

"(A) special education teaching, including speech-language pathology and adaptive physical education;

"(B) related services in educational settings;

"(C) special education supervision and administration;

"(D) special education research; and

"(E) training of special education personnel.

"(2) The Secretary shall ensure that grants awarded to applicant institutions and agencies under this subsection meet State and professionally recognized standards for the training of special education and related services personnel.

"(3) The Secretary in carrying out the purposes of this subsection may reserve a sum not to exceed 5 per centum of the amount available for this subsection in each fiscal year for contracts to prepare personnel in areas where shortages exist, when a response to that need has not been adequately addressed by the grant process.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education and other appropriate nonprofit agencies to conduct special projects to develop and demonstrate new approaches for the preservice training purposes set forth in subsection (a), for regular educators, and for the inservice training of special education personnel, including classroom aides, related services personnel, and regular education personnel who serve handicapped children.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to make grants through a separate competition to private nonprofit organizations for the purpose of providing training and information to parents of handicapped children and volunteers to enable such individuals to participate more effectively with professionals in meeting the educational needs of handicapped children. Such grants shall be designed to meet the unique training and information needs of parents of handicapped children, including those who are members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented, living in the area to be served by the grant.

"GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR TRAINEESHIPS

"SEC. 632. The Secretary shall make grants to State educational agencies (and payments to comparable educational agencies or offices in the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior) to assist them in establishing and maintaining, directly or through grants to institutions of higher education, programs for the preservice and inservice training of teachers of handicapped children, or supervisiors of such teachers.

"GRANTS TO IMPROVE RECRUITMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE HANDICAPPED

"SEC. 633. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make a grant to our enter into a contract with a public agency or a nonprofit private organization or institution for a national clearinghouse on the education of the handicapped and to make grants or contracts with a public agency or a nonprofit private organization or institution for other support projects which may be deemed necessary by the Secretary to achieve the following objectives:

"(1) to disseminate information and provide technical assistance on a national basis to parents, professionals, and other interested parties concerning—

"(A) programs relating to the education of the handicapped under this Act and under other Federal laws;

"(B) participation in such programs, including referral of individuals to appropriate national, State, and local agencies and organizations for further assistance; and

"(C) technical assistance in establishing, developing, and coordinating State and local parent training and information programs;

"(2) to encourage students and professional personnel to seek and obtain careers and employment in the various fields relating to the education of handicapped children and youth; and

"(3) to provide information on available services and programs in postsecondary education for the handicapped.

"(b) In awarding the grants and contracts under this section, the Secretary shall give particular attention to any demonstrated experience at the national level relevant to performance of the functions established in this section, and ability to conduct such projects, communicate with the intended consumers of information, and maintain the necessary communication with other agencies and organizations.

"REPORTS TO THE SECRETARY

"SEC. 634. (a) Not more than sixty days after the end of any fiscal year, each recipient of a grant or contract under this part during such fiscal year shall prepare and submit a report to the Secretary. Each such report shall be in such form and detail as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, and shall include—

"(1) the number of individuals trained under the grant or contract, by category of training and level of training; and

"(2) the number of individuals trained under the grant or contract receiving degrees and certification, by category and level of training.

"(b) A summary of the data required by this section shll be included in the annual report of the Secretary under section 618 of this Act.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 635. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this part (other than section 633) $58,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $61,150,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $64,370,000 for fiscal year 1987. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of section 633, $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $1,050,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $1,110,000 for fiscal year 1987.".

AMENDMENTS RELATED TO RESEARCH IN THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

SEC. 12. Part E of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"PART E—RESEARCH IN THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

"RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS IN EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

"SEC. 641. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, State and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public agencies and nonprofit private organizations for research and related activities, to assist special education personnel, related services personnel, and other appropriate persons, including parents, in improving the education and related services for handicapped children and youth and to conduct research, surveys, or demonstrations relating to the education of handicapped children. Research and related activities assisted under this section shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

"(1) The development of new and improved techniques for teaching handicapped children.

"(2) The development of curricula which meet the unique educational needs of handicapped children.

"(3) The application of new technologies and knowledge for the purpose of improving the instruction of handicapped children.

"(4) The development of program models and demonstrations in areas of special education in need of such models and demonstrations.

"(b) In carrying out this section the Secretary shall consider the special education experience of the applicant and the ability of the applicant to disseminate the findings of any grant or contract.

"(c) The Secretary shall publish proposed research priorities in the Federal Register every two years, not later than July 1, and shall allow a period of sixty days for public comments and suggestions. After analyzing and considering the public comments, the Secretary shall publish final research priorities in the Federal Register not later than thirty days after the close of the comment period.

"(d) The Secretary shall provide an index (including the title of each research project and the name and address of the researching organization) of all research projects conducted in the prior fiscal year in the annual report described under section 618. The Secretary shall make reports of research projects available to the education community at large and to other interested parties.

"(e) The Secretary shall coordinate the research priorities established under this section with research priorities established by the National Institute of Handicapped Research and shall provide information concerning research priorities estabIsihed under this section to the National Council on the Handicapped and to the National Advisory Committee on the Education of Handicapped Children.

"RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

"SEC. 642. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States, State or local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public or nonprofit private educational or research agencies and organizations, and to make contracts with States, State or local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public or private educational or research agencies and organizations, for research and related purposes relating to physical education or recreation for handicapped children, and to conduct research, surveys, or demonstrations relating to physical education or recreation for handicapped children.

"PANELS OF EXPERTS

"SEC. 643. The Secretary shall from time to time appoint panels of experts who are competent to evaluate various types of proposals for projects under parts C, D, E, and F, and shall secure the advice and recommendations of one such panel before making any grant or contract under parts C, D, E, and F of this Act. The panels shall be composed of—

"(1) individuals from the field of special education for the handicapped and other relevant disciplines who have significant expertise and experience in the content areas and age levels addressed in the proposals; and

"(2) handicapped individuals and parents of handicapped individuals when appropriate.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 644. For the purposes of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $21,100,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $22,200,000 for fiscal year 1987.".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA

SEC. 13. Section 654 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 654. For the purposes of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $19,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $21,100,000 for fiscal year 1987.".

REPEALERS

SEC. 14. Part G of the Act is repealed.

TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 15. Section 611(e) and section 611(a)(2) of the Act are amended by inserting "the Northern Mariana Islands," after "the Virgin Islands,".

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 16. This Act shall take effect October 1, 1984.

Mr. MURPHY. I apologize to the witnesses for being tardy. We have a very important caucus going on on the floor and an extremely important full committee meeting going on downstairs on the Vocational and Educational Rehabilitation Act. So, we're trying to divide our time this morning. The other members are downstairs trying to form a quorum of the full committee to get a vote and I may have to pop out to do that.

So, for our first panel of witnesses today I'm very pleased to welcome Mrs. Madeleine Will, Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, the U.S. Department of Education, on her first appearance before the subcommittee.

Mrs. Will, will you please introduce the gentleman accompanying you? You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MADELEINE WILL, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, ACCOMPANIED BY EDWARD SONTAG, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mrs. WILL. Yes. I have with me Dr. Edward Sontag, deputy director of special education programs.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes; we've had quite a bit of contact with the Doctor and we do appreciate his presence. Thank you, Doctor.

Dr. SONTAG. Thank you, Mr. Murphy.

Mrs. WILL. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee on Select Education and discuss what I see as some of the major priorities which the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services will focus on during my tenure. I would like also to share my views regarding some of the discretionary programs being considered for reauthorization.

As I have spoken with parents, handicapped people, advocates, and professionals, one basic trend emerges. We have made significant strides toward our goal of full access and equal opportunity for handicapped people, but we have a long way to go. There still remain gaps as well as overlaps in what is envisioned to be a comprehensive service delivery system. Specifically, two groups of handicapped youngsters can benefit from improved services. These groups are the very young handicapped children and the thousands of youngsters who are leaving our secondary schools to seek employment and independence.

When the 1979 Department of Education Organization Act was enacted, it was clear that the basic purpose was to create an OSERS which could better coordinate Federal activity. OSERS has made contributions in this regard and I intend to manage OSERS with the basic goal of coordinated and collaborative service delivery.

Clearly, H.R. 3435, the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1984, recognizes the serious problems which face these children OSERS was created to serve. I received the bill just this week, so I cannot offer you the administration's views on its

specific provisions. The Department will send the subcommittee a letter on the bill as soon as we have fully analyzed its provisions.

I do, however, concur fully with the bill's emphasis and have identified early childhood intervention and the availability of comprehensive coordinated services for secondary and postsecondary age youngsters as major priorities for OSERS.

Obviously Federal money alone is not the key to improving State and local practices. Our resources, like those of States and localities, are limited. However, with available resources we can, and intend to, do a better job of giving States the benefit of our research and demonstration efforts so they can strengthen their program.

In the area of early intervention, the opportunity to improve childrens' futures is substantial. We have developed a knowledge base which, if more readily available, can help States improve the quality of services. OSERS is now working on two basic strategies to deal with this critical issue.

First, we will use the handicapped children's early education program and the resources of the National Institute of Handicapped Research to develop training materials and audiovisual presentations as a systematic effort to develop a partnership with health professionals. This activity will be designed and implemented collaboratively as a major initiative to insure that all individuals serving very young handicapped children are fully aware of the tremendous benefits of early intervention.

Second, we are planning to redirect some of the resources of the handicapped children's early education program toward a major initiative which will place information in the hands of decisionmakers at the State and local level. I firmly believe that the effectiveness of early intervention is so clearly documented, that State and local policymakers and service providers will see the benefits and move to develop more responsive and comprehensive services when a full awareness of its tremendous potential is achieved.

I have firsthand knowledge of the benefits of early intervention and the reports of studies in this area resoundingly confirm my personal views. Early intervention can actually reduce the number of children needing special services, save millions of dollars, and even save families.

Unlike problems which we often confront, we currently know what can be done to increase the availability of early intervention. The handicapped children's early education program is currently funding many projects dealing directly with solutions to early diagnosis, coordination of services, and effective interventions. We are presently funding three early childhood institutes which are addressing diagnosis, coordination, and teaching directly. In addition, over half of our demonstration projects are developing models for the birth-to-2-year-old population. Many of these projects are working directly with pediatricians, neonatologists, and nurses in nurseries.

I believe we can bring this expertise and experience to bear on this serious problem and, in the near future, see a dramatic change for the better for all of us.

In the area of secondary/postsecondary handicapped students the solutions are more difficult to identify. Because pieces of the solu-

tion are in place and many of the services are available, the challenge is one of helping States and localities create an integrated service delivery structure from a variety of resources.

By accepting this challenge of assisting in the development of integrated services we can move into the area of what I call continuous habilitation, which is a long-term endeavor requiring sustained effort over the next several years. While I believe this is a tremendous challenge, we must confront it. If we do not we will lose the opportunity to insure that handicapped children can attain their full potential as contributors to American society.

The success of the public schools in providing access to education for handicapped children is well documented. However, in order to establish a stable foundation for a system built upon the concept of continuous habilitation, several persistent problems must be immediately confronted and resolved. Some of these problems are specific to special education while others emerge as a function of educational needs merging with vocational employment and community living needs.

Contemporary wisdom, recent legislation, and emerging practice emphasize a service delivery system based upon the needs of handicapped individuals who are leaving the public school system to confront a society which makes complex demands for which handicapped youngsters could be better prepared.

Education, vocational training, and rehabilitative services have been developed as self-contained systems, each of which is engaged at a certain time in the lifespan of a handicapped individual. Only in rare instances do the independent systems recognize that they contribute to the way in which we must begin to program continuous habilitation.

Even though I have concentrated my remarks on the problems that currently exist, I do want to assure you that progress has been made and that there are several excellent models which can serve as guides to action.

Work at the University of Oregon and the University of Washington has shown that the application of a behavioral analytical approach to the teaching of specific job tasks has enabled moderately and severely handicapped individuals to secure competitive employment.

The University of Wisconsin—Madison, in cooperation with the Madison Metropolitan School District, has developed a program based upon coordination with local adult service providers and employers which allows for longitudinal systematic planning into the world of work. This coordination between public school personnel, employers, and adult service providers begins in the middle school, increases during secondary school, and has resulted in startling increases in the number of severely handicapped students who are employed in nonsheltered environments.

Also, the Rehabilitation Services Administration and the Office of Special Education Programs have jointly funded a project to identify successful models which coordinate rehabilitation and educational services. These models and others can assist us in solving some of the complex service delivery problems within a reasonable period of time. However, a number of clear disincentives to continuous rehabilitation may remain outside of OSERS' direct control.

In these instances there may be need to increase cooperative Federal, State, local- and private-sector initiatives to design long-term solutions and to analyze the need for joint responses. I will work closely with the Secretary to see that the Department's legislative and budget proposals reflect these priorities. I believe we can meet these challenges and every resource available to OSERS will be used to do so.

I appreciate the time you have made available to me and look forward to working together with you to provide the highest quality services to handicapped people. I will be happy to answer any questions you might have.

[The prepared statement of Madeleine C. Will follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MADELEINE C. WILL, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee on Select Education and discuss what I see as some of the major priorities which the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will focus on during my tenure. I would like also to share my views regarding some of the discretionary programs being considered for reauthorization.

As I have spoken with parents, handicapped people, advocates and professionals, one basic trend emerges. We have made significant strides towards our goal of full access to equal opportunity for handicapped people, but we have a long way to go. There still remain gaps as well as overlaps in what is envisioned to be a comprehensive service delivery system. Specifically two groups of handicapped youngsters can benefit from improved services. These groups are the very young handicapped children, and the thousands of youngsters who are leaving our secondary schools to seek employment and independence.

When the 1979 Department of Education Organization Act was enacted, it was clear that the basic purpose was to create an OSERS which could better coordinate Federal activity. OSERS has made contributions in this regard and I intend to manage OSERS with the basic goal of coordinated and collaborative service delivery.

Clearly, H.R. 3435, Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1984, recognizes the serious problems which face these children OSERS was created to serve. I received the bill just this week, so I cannot offer you the Administration's views on its specific provisions. The Department will send the subcommittee a letter on the bill as soon as we have fully analyzed its provisions.

I do, however, concur fully with the bill's emphasis and have identified early childhood intervention and the availability of comprehensive coordinated services to secondary and postsecondary age youngsters as major priorities for OSERS. Obviously, Federal money alone is not the key to improving State and local practices. Our resources, like those of States and localities, are limited. However, with available resources we can, and intend to, do a better job of giving States the benefit of our research and demonstration efforts so they can strengthen their programs. In the area of early intervention, the opportunity to improve children's futures is substantial. We have developed a knowledge base which if more readily available can help States improve the quality of services. OSERS is now working on two basic strategies to deal with this critical issue.

First, we will use the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program and the resources of the National Institute of Handicapped Research to develop training materials and audio visual presentations as a systematic effort to develop a partnership with health professionals. This activity will be designed and implemented collaboratively as a major initiative to ensure that all individuals serving very young handicapped children are fully aware of the tremendous benefits of early intervention.

Second, we are planning to redirect some of the resources of the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program toward a major initiative which will place information in the hands of decision makers at the State and local level. I firmly believe that the effectiveness of early intervention is so clearly documented, that State and local policy makers and service providers will see the benefits and move to develop more responsive and comprehensive services when a full awareness of its tremendous potential is achieved.

I have first-hand knowledge of the benefits of early intervention and the reports of studies into this area resoundingly confirm my personal views. Early intervention can actually reduce the number of children needing special services, save millions of dollars, and even save families.

Unlike problems which we often confront, we currently know what can be done to increase the availability of early intervention. The Handicappped Children's Early Education Program is currently funding many projects dealing directly with solutions to early diagnosis, coordination of services, and effective interventions. We are presently funding three Early Childhood Institutes which are addressing diagnosis, coordination, and teaching directly. In addition, over half of our demonstration projects are developing models for the birth-to-two-year-old population. Many of these projects are working directly with pediatricians, neonatalogists, and nurses in nurseries.

I believe we can bring this expertise and experience to bear on this serious problem and, in the near future, see a dramatic change for the better for all of us.

In the area of secondary/post-secondary handicapped students the solutions are more difficult to identify. Because pieces of the solutions are in place and many of the services are available, the challenge is one of helping States and localities create an integrated service delivery structure from a variety of resources.

By accepting this challenge of assisting in the development of integrated services we can move into the area of what I call continuous habilitation which is a long term endeavor requiring sustained effort over the next several years. While I believe this is a tremendous challenge we must confront it. If we do not we will lose the opportunity to ensure that handicapped children can attain their full potential as contributors to American society.

The success of the public schools in providing access to education for handicapped children is well-documented. However, in order to establish a stable foundation for a system built upon the concept of continuous habilitation, several persistent problems must be immediately confronted and resolved. Some of these problems are specific to Special Education, while others emerge as a function of educational needs merging with vocational, employment and community living needs.

Contemporary wisdom, recent legislation, and emerging practice emphasize a service delivery system based upon the needs of handicapped individuals who are leaving the public school system to confront a society which makes complex demands for which handicapped youngsters could be better prepared.

Education, vocational training, and rehabilitative services have been developed as self-contained systems, each of which is engaged at a certain time in the life span of a handicapped individual. Only in rare instances do the independent systems recognize that they contribute to the way in which we must begin to program continuous habilitation.

Even though I have concentrated my remarks on the problems which currently exist, I do want to assure you that progress has been made and that there are several excellent models which can serve as guides to action.

Work at the University of Oregon and the University of Washington has shown that the application of a behavioral analytical approach to the teaching of specific job tasks has enabled moderately and severely handicapped individuals to secure competitive employment.

The University of Wisconsin—Madison in cooperation with the Madison Metropolitan School District has developed a program based upon coordination with local adult service providers and employers which allows for longitudinal, systematic planning into the world of work. This coordination between public school personnel, employers, and adult service providers begins in the middle school, increases during secondary school, and has resulted in startling increases in the number of severely handicapped students who are employed in non-sheltered environments.

Also, the Rehabilitation Services Administration and the Office of Special Education Programs have jointly funded a project to identify successful models which coordinate rehabilitation and educational services.

These models and others can assist us in solving some of the complex service delivery problems within a reasonable period of time. However, a number of clear disincentives to continuous habilitation may remain outside of OSERS's direct control. In these instances, there may be need to increase cooperative federal, State, local, and private sector initiatives to design long term solutions and to analyze the need for joint responses. I will work closely with the Secretary to see that the Department's legislative and budget proposals reflect these priorities.

I believe we can meet these challenges and every resource available to OSERS will be used to do so.

I appreciate the time you have made available to me and look forward to working together with you to provide the highest quality services to handicapped people.

I will be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mrs. Will, thank you for being here today. The chairman and I apologize for the lateness of the hearing getting started, we will be somewhat in and out, the situation will be disruptive this morning and I do apologize. We're having a major difference of opinion in the committee markup just downstairs at the full committee as to whether the Education of the Handicapped Act ought to be reauthorized up here in this hearing room or whether it's going to be reauthorized as a part of the Rehabilitation Act, which is going on downstairs. I offer this information just so you will know what the difficulty is at this point.

So, I do apologize. The chairman will be back in a little while. He is attempting to help the chairman of the full committee obtain a quorum and I'll probably stay here for a little while. I'm trying to keep the quorum from happening, so——

[Laughter.]

Mr. BARTLETT. That gives you some indication.

I believe that the Education of the Handicapped Act and the Rehabilitation Act are related; one for youth and students, and the other for adults. I believe that legislative actions on those laws should be conducted in a bipartisan manner and which will help the maximum number of people.

I do think that there are issues that we ought to look at and you've raised many in your testimony on this reauthorization bill prefacing to the discretionary programs. I welcome you to this process. I know—you've been involved in the area—I also welcome you to the administration.

I am looking forward to your office, and Congress, and this subcommittee working together toward strengthening our Nation's commitment to the education of the handicapped and finding specific ways to do that. And so I welcome your testimony and have reviewed it and will continue to.

If you will pardon me just a second, I want to review a question, some of the questions which we may have for you. [Pause.]

I understand there was a decision to award the contract for the National Information Center for Handicapped Children and Youth to Inter-America Research Associates in December 1982. I wonder, there has been some controversy and some questions raised about that. I wonder if you are prepared this morning to discuss the merits or results of that contract and the status of the contract at this point, some 6 months afterward?

Mrs. WILL. Yes; Mr. Bartlett, I only recently became aware of the contract and some of the problems that have emerged. I'm not sure that I can address your questions in total detail. Perhaps Dr. Sontag can assist me but I am—I would like to give you some background information.

Mr. BARTLETT. Please do.

Mrs. WILL. The contract for the National Information Center for Handicapped Children and Youth was awarded on September 16, 1982. It is a 3-year contract, a part of the recruitment and information program authorized under part B of Public Law 91-230.

The purpose of the contract is to provide a systematic method of disseminating comprehensive information about programs, services, resources available to handicapped children and youth. After a review process an award was made and a procedure then began which I would like to outline for you.

There were a number of meetings as part of an ongoing monitoring process which took place between October 3, 1982, through June 22 this year, and, indeed, problems did emerge as a result of discussions in these meetings. Specifically relating to the quality of products, written products, produced by the contractor and the difficulties in meeting timelines.

On July 1, a letter of direction was sent to the contractor outlining difficulties and asking for a response, which the Department has received, but which the Department has not had sufficient time to analyze.

If a decision, a judgment, is made that the contractor is delinquent, there are two bases for termination of contract, termination for default and termination for convenience. However, at this point there does not seem to be—the facts would not sustain a termination.

Mr. BARTLETT. Do you have anything to add to that, or is that it?

Dr. SONTAG. I think Mrs. Will has provided, Mr. Bartlett, an excellent summary of the state of the art with Inter-America. It's a contract that's very important to the Department and it's very important to parents and children, handicapped children.

We have worked quite vigorously with the contractor to make sure that they come up to speed, so to speak, in terms of meeting the major tasks outlined in this very important procurement, and we remain optimistic that they will be able to fulfill the terms of the contract.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mrs. Will, would you, then, from time to time, as things develop, and if anything changes, either for the good or for the bad with that contract, I think there has been some interest expressed by this committee, if you could keep us informed.

Mrs. WILL. We'll be happy to do so.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think we would appreciate that.

On a different subject, the Senate reauthorization bill, S. 1341, has a passthrough provision in it which is intended to correct a situation in the State of Missouri with respect to handicapped children in private schools. I understand that the Office of Special Education Programs has prepared lengthy comments on this provision. Would you comment this morning on that Missouri situation and provide us with information on a continuing basis as you review that passthrough provision and its impact on Missouri private schools?

Mrs. WILL. Yes, Mr. Bartlett. There is undoubtedly a great deal of confusion regarding the current requirements and also there are proposals being considered to institute a bypass mechanism for providing EHAB funds for private-school handicapped children without involving State and local education agencies. While a bypass provision may be the only way to resolve issues presented by States where current Federal requirements conflict with State laws, the prospect of a bypass raises many questions yet to be answered.

For example, since EHAB funds, unlike those under chapter 1, which currently has a bypass provision, only supplements State and local expenditures for mandated services. It is unclear who would bear the fiscal responsibility for providing the remainder of the services.

I assume that even if a bypass provision for EHAB were enacted, most States would not elect to invoke this provision. Therefore, regardless of what other measures are taken, I perceive a need to clarify the current private school requirements. My office will continue to evaluate this issue. We do feel that the implications for bypass are enormous. They may be for States as well as the private schools. They may be advantageous as well as disadvantageous.

Mr. BARTLETT. You testified about your emphasis on the merits of early intervention. I assume that will be one of the priorities that you set, then, in your role.

Mrs. WILL. Yes, indeed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Of the 10 discretionary programs that serve the handicapped, which will be reviewed to see how they may facilitate early intervention. Will you be doing it across the board, I suppose?

Mrs. WILL. Yes, Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. BARTLETT. So you will review each of the handicapped programs to see how they can better serve the goal of early intervention?

Mrs. WILL. Let me refer to my notes here.

Mr. BARTLETT. All right.

Mrs. WILL. We are, indeed, going to look at all of the programs across OSERS to identify ways in which we can target moneys to serving handicapped children, the very young handicapped children. For example, in personnel preparation we can serve the dual goal of providing free service training, encouraging more young people to become teachers. We know that there is a very serious shortfall. And we can encourage them to work with the very young handicapped children. This can be done in research, as well.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would also urge, and I know that this will be part of your program, that you would look at other Federal programs, such as nutrition and school lunch programs and other Federal programs, to coordinate and improve early intervention and identification of handicapped children.

Mrs. WILL. Yes, that work is ongoing. My Office regularly coordinates with the Office of Maternal Child Health under Health and Human Services. In fact, I expect to have a series of recommendations made to me about ways in which the two offices can coordinate in targeting youngsters at risk, infants at risk.

Mr. BARTLETT. And, Mrs. Will, I have one final question. The chairman has returned. This is not directly related to the discretionary programs that you testified on today but it's related to the entire subject and I would pose it to you, and if you're not prepared to answer it today I would pose it as a thinking question.

The public, perhaps Congress, and perhaps the administration reacts strongly to the controversy on the proposed changes in regulations on Public Law 94-142. Many felt the changes went too far. The changes created a great deal of controversy, and so the regulations were withdrawn and nothing was done.

My question is do you think that there will be a way to, with less fanfare and without going so far as to eliminate the civil rights provision and protections of Public Law 94-142, do you think that there—maybe I'm just wishful thinking—that there could be a way to, in fact, to change some of the regulations which would help schools and teachers deal with handicapped students, to remove some of the more burdensome paperwork requirements, without taking away the essence of the fundamental civil rights commitment, which I know that you share? I suppose I raise that not in the expectation that you're prepared with a final answer today, but is there a way that we can help you approach that question?

Mrs. WILL. I think that there are always ways to improve a set of regulations, or a statute, or a program and that is a charge to us. In terms of the Public Law 94-142 regulations, my Office has just about completed an extensive analysis of the comments that were received in response to the August 4 NPRM, and the volume of response was such that it required an extensive amount of work.

I indicated in another hearing that I wanted an opportunity to evaluate those comments myself and I also wanted an opportunity to set up within my immediate Office an outreach program that would enable me to get comments and input from parents, professionals, disabled people. I feel that it's very important for the administration to do this, to demonstrate this willingness to listen now, after these regulatory efforts.

So, yes, I do think that there are ways that we can work together and, in fact, I'm aware of Congressman Murphy's commission on the financing—it's very appropriate—for public education, which has made some very interesting recommendations which I would like to, again, to have a chance to consider.

Mr. BARTLETT. Excellent, excellent. I know this committee, I, personally, and Chairman Murphy, we look forward to working with you. I apologize for, again, the hectic nature of this morning. Congress has often been accused of being in a chaotic situation constantly. Actually, this is a rather unusual day for us but it is somewhat chaotic.

To further add to the confusion, I personally have to leave and I apologize. In addition to everything else that is happening, I am meeting with the President on the International Monetary Fund. It will not be just the President and Steve Bartlett. There will be a few other Congressmen there. [Laughter.]

But it will be a small enough group that my absence would be noticed, and so I will leave at this point and try to come back, depending on how long that takes, the IMF being a rather large subject also. But I do appreciate your service and I, at some point, perhaps, Chairman Murphy, and I, and you, we might sit down and begin to review some of those programs and work through them. I think that's the door that's open at this point as we begin to make this fresh start, and I thank you for your willingness to serve and your testimony.

Mr. MURPHY. Give my regards to Ronnie. Best wishes for his health. [Laughter.]

Mrs. Will, I have two. Were you active or aware, I guess, of the proposed changes in the regulations of Public Law 94-142 a year

ago, August, when it all erupted? Were you aware of what was going on?

Mrs. WILL. Yes; I was aware that there was a process in place. I did not have access to documents.

Mr. MURPHY. You weren't one of the protesters?

Mrs. WILL. I did oppose them in the hearing, yes.

Mr. MURPHY. You did, yes.

Mrs. WILL. Yes, I did.

Mr. MURPHY. Did you appear with transcripts and oppose them in hearings at that time?

Mrs. WILL. I represented myself in the hearing but indicated that I worked with a parent group.

Mr. MURPHY. We had a considerable, as you know, opposition to the numerous changes that were being made. Of course, I had great concern over that and we held hearings, accepted petitions. Let me ask you, do you have—is there any movement now in your Department to come out with another set of changes in the regulations that you're aware of?

Mrs. WILL. I indicated to Mr. Bartlett that we are not at that point. We have to evaluate the responses that the Department receives on the August 4 NPRM and that has required a tremendous amount of work. I would like to review those analyses myself. I would like a chance to talk to parents, professionals, and disabled people, and at this point there is no plan.

Mr. MURPHY. I appreciate that and I really appreciate your position on it. I suggested to Secretary Bell when he announced before this subcommittee that he was withdrawing the previous regulations, that our staff and myself would be very happy and willing to meet with your staff or with his staff at a time, if he's contemplating them, before, I think, they get to the stage of published rule changes. We could perhaps offer some insight so that we don't get into that period of conflict that we had, because it deeply upset many people, both in Congress and out, and more on the outside than in.

One thing that I would appreciate your cooperation on is the Inter-America response or lack of response in their contract, and wonder if you could provide us—I regret I missed your comments to Mr. Bartlett on that part of that, but I think what we would like is to have the site-visit report for our record and the Inter-America response to that site visit, and I guess encourage you to get that matter brought to your desk and straightened out. I think it's only fair to the people who are involved, to the consumers, to your Department, as well as Congress, and we would appreciate if you could provide us with that information.

Then also, perhaps, in due time, drop us a note and let us know what progress is being made.

Mrs. WILL. We'll be happy to do all of that, Mr. Murphy. In fact, one of the documents is supplied to you today.

Mr. MURPHY. OK. Thank you very much. We will now proceed with the next witness. I thank you very much, Mrs. Will, and Doctor, for being with us this morning.

Mrs. WILL. You're very welcome.

Mr. MURPHY. Dr. Eleanor Chelimsky.

I will go downstairs and answer a quorum call.

[Brief recess.]

Mr. MURPHY. I'm pleased to be joined by Congressman Williams from the great sky country. OK. Dr. Chelimsky, you may proceed, and we apologize again, as I stated, between our Chairman Perkins and the President we're having a hard time sitting still today. [Laughter.]

You may proceed.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Eleanor Chelimsky follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ELEANOR CHELIMSKY, DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE ABBREVIATED STATEMENT

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, we are pleased to be here today to testify on what existing studies indicate about deaf/blind children and about the Deaf/Blind Centers and Services Program. In order to respond to the Subcommittee's time constraints and need for brevity, we are presenting only the highlights of the attached abbreviated statement of our findings.

In a nutshell, based on our review, we make the following 13 points:

(1) Information about the centers and the populations they serve is surprisingly incomplete and inconsistent, given the small number of centers and the small population sizes involved.

(2) This serious problem of information quality means that our numbers can best be considered and used as approximations.

(3) The number of deaf/blind children for the year 1982 ranges from about 2,600 (if one uses the State reports from Public Laws 94-142 and 89-313 combined), through about 3,500 (if the Registry for Deaf/Blind Children is consulted) to about 5,400 (using reports from Deaf/Blind Center directors to the Office of Special Education Programs).

(4) We do find that most rubella epidemic deaf/blind children appear to have been located by the centers.

(5) Rubella epidemic children will soon be ineligible for services, some in 1985, all by the end of 1988.

(6) Congenital rubella still results in deaf/blindness for approximately 15 to 110 children per birth year.

(7) Between approximately 100 and 140 children per birth year are born or become deaf/blind due to causes other than congenital rubella.

(8) Deaf/blindness exists in different degrees. In one State, for example, the degree of "blindness" for the deaf/blind children includes about 36 percent of the children "visually impaired," 21 percent "legally blind," 20 percent "with light preception only," and 23 percent "totally blind"; "deafness" includes about 50 percent with "mild or moderate" hearing loss and 50 percent with "severe or profound" hearing loss.

(9) Deaf/blind children are very often multiply handicapped.

(10) Center activities seem to be nominally well matched to center objectives with regard to direct services to children, counseling and consulting services, and training professionals in deaf/blind education; however, the lack of effectiveness evaluation precludes discussion of the quality of these services.

(11) Center activities do not seem to be well matched with the center objectives for demonstration and dissemination (that is, to develop new, better, and demonstrably effective ways to serve deaf/blind children).

(12) Most centers seem to allocate most of their funds to subcontracts. However, the distribution of center purchases is unclear with respect to direct service, indirect service, and/or technical assistance.

(13) Finally, average expenditures per child range from about $1,600 to about $5,600, depending on the center. The actual cost for each child, however, is unknown.

This concludes our discussion of highlights from our abbreviated statement. More detail is available in that attached statement, and of course, we would be pleased to explain any part of it and answer any questions you may have.

ABBREVIATED STATEMENT

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, we are pleased to be here today to testify on what existing studies indicate about deaf/blind children and about the

Deaf/Blind Centers and Services Program. As you know, these centers were authorized in 1968 in response to the rubella epidemic of 1963-1965 during which many children were believed to have been born deaf and blind as a result of their mothers having contracted rubella. The centers were also authorized, however, to serve deaf/blind children regardless of the cause of their deaf/blindness.

This January the Subcommittee asked GAO to examine existing studies to determine what sound information is available on changes in the population of deaf/blind children since the rubella epidemic of 1963-1965, and on the services children have received through the centers. Today we are presenting what we have learned from our review of the findings of published evaluations and readily available data which we have supplemented by discussions with agency officials and with experts at the Center for Disease Control. For the published evaluations, we assessed the adequacy of the methods used, determined the soundness of the information they produced, and identified remaining gaps in the information needed by the Subcommittee. We also reviewed the completeness of readily available data and the logic of the analyses applied to them. In general, it's fair to say we found large gaps in the availability of sound information about deaf/blind children served, about the types of services provided to them, and about the costs of these services.

Information is incomplete and inconsistent

There were five reasons to expect relatively complete information about deaf/blind children and the centers:

(1) The numbers of centers is small—15 at present—and many have been in operation for more than 10 years.

(2) The focal population also is small—that is, rubella epidemic children who are deaf and blind—and those children should have been located and served since 1969, when the first centers tht the Congress authorized began operations.

(3) The entire eligible population—all children from 0 through 21 years of age suffering some degree of deaf/blindness regardless of cause—again is small and again should been served since 1969.

(4) Existing regulations require an adequate system of records.

(5) Finally, a Registry for Deaf/Blind Children has been in operation since 1969.

Despite these factors, published or readily available information on the children and centers is, in fact, both incomplete and inconsistent. Here are four examples:

(1) Records at the Registry, despite the efforts of the staff, have so much missing information that the data have almost more holes than fabric. For example, two large States list about 650 children in the Registry but do not report the causes of deaf/blindness for 99 percent of them.

(2) The only nation-wide studies we located were carried out within the last few years. Two are surveys of the persons who serve the children on their views of met and unmet needs for service. The third study—assessing the match between objectives and operations in the centers—did not look at program effectiveness.

(3) There appear to be neither published national longitudinal studies of the progress of the children while they are eligible for center assistance nor of how they have fared after reaching 22 years of age. Thus, there is little empirical basis for (a) evaluating how well the program is meeting the children's needs, (b) examining whether the congressional intention that the children be helped to communicate with, adjust to, and participate meaningfully in society has been fulfilled, or (c) assessing what service they still need after reaching age 22.

(4) The data that do exist are elastic. Numbers in any given reporting period can differ by as much as 15 percent.

We present these concerns to emphasize the caution required in dealing with "factual" information about many aspects of the children's needs and services. Even for such a simple "fact" as the numbers of deaf/blind children in 1982, there are three different figures (with several possible reasons for the differences): about 2,600 from the combined Public Law 94-142 and 89-313 State reports, about 3,500 from the Registry, and about 5,400 from the center Directors' reports to the Office of Special Educational Programs. Thus the findings we report here today are of necessity based on judgment calls at least to some degree. We signal them by our use of the word "about" in giving figures.

Findings

(1) Most rubella epidemic deaf/blind children appear to have been located by the centers.—In a 1969 report, the rubella epidemic of 1963-1965 was estimated as likely to have caused handicaps for about 20,000 children: 5,500 visually impaired, 12,000 hearing impaired, 1,250 retarded/crippled, and 1,250 deaf/blind. We estimate the deaf/blind centers have located about 1,640 rubella epidemic-age children. Of those,

we believe about 1,360 are deaf/blind due to congenital rubella, a figure close to the 1969 projections.

(2) Some ruoella epidemic children will be ineligible for services beginning in 1985: All will be ineligible by the end of 1988.—In 1985, the leading edge of rubella epidemic children who are deaf/blind to some degree will reach their 22nd birthday when they will be ineligible for service through the centers. By the end of 1988, all of the deaf/blind rubella epidemic age children will have reached 22 years of age.

(3) Congenital rubella still makes some children deaf and blind.—Despite a developed vaccine and a vigorous immunization program, rubella is still with us. Local outbreaks occur on college campuses, in military barracks and other settings in which large numbers of people congregate. Among girls and young women of childbearing age, those 15 to 19 years of age have the highest rates of rubella each year. The Center for Disease Control has joined some health associations in arguing for a national immunization effort for women of child-bearing age.

The Center for Disease Control estimates that about 250 to 1,000 cases of newborns with the congenital rubella syndrome occur each year. If about 6 percent of these babies eventually develop some degree of deaf/blindness, then we have about 15 to 60 additional children deaf/blind due to rubella annually. If, however, we extrapolate from cases reported to the Registry, then about 110 new children annually suffer some degree of deaf/blindness due to congenital rubella. Thus, the number of new children swelling the ranks of the deaf/blind each year due to congenital rubella is likely to be between 15 and about 110.

(4) Rubella is not the only cause of deaf/blindness.—Some children not affected by rubella are born deaf and become blind for unrelated reasons such as child abuse and accident. Some are born blind and become deaf for unrelated reasons. Some suffer from a genetic disease called Usher's Syndrome in which a child born deaf becomes progressively blind during adolescence. The Registry has identified 55 causes other than rubella associated with some degree of deaf/blindness.

The number of children per birth year who are reported to have been born or to suffer some degree of deaf/blindness due to causes other than rubella has remained relatively steady. Extrapolating from Registry identification, we estimate about 110 per year prior to the epidemic, about 100 per year during the epidemic, about 140 per year in the 9 years after the epidemic, and about 110 per birth year in recent years.

In the absence of such changes as a highly successful immunization program, a redefinition of deaf/blindness or in statutorily mandated reported, it is unlikely that there will be sudden increases or decreases nationally in the numbers of deaf/blind children reported.

(5) Children have different degrees of deaf/blindness.—Children located by the centers have different degrees of deaf/blindness. We can see this through the use of indirect indicators such as the communication methods reported by a small sample of teachers of the deaf/blind children. These methods ranged from unaided speech to finger alphabets. More teachers reported using visual sign language than any other single method; the method reported by the next largest number of teachers was hand-on-hand sign language. This suggests that while many children may have some auditory or visual capacity, some also are almost wholly deaf and blind. The Registry's report form provides for degrees of blindness ranging from "visually impaired" to total blindness and for degrees of deafness ranging from "mild" to "profound." A State, which is said to have relatively complete and accurate data, reports that of children for whom degree of deafness is known, 50 percent have "mild" or "moderate" loss and 50 percent "severe" and "profound" hearing loss. Of the children for whom degree of vision is known, 36 percent are "visually impaired," 21 percent are "legally blind," 20 percent have "light perception only," and 23 percent are "totally blind."

(6) They have other handicaps too.—Only about 24 percent of the approximately 2,000 children for whom the existence (or not) of additional handicaps is reported to the Registry, suffer some degree of deaf/blindness without additional handicaps. About 76 percent are deaf/blind to some degree with at least one additional handicap.

Diagnosis is often difficult. A deaf/blind child may appear to be mentally retarded, for example, due to sensory problems in communication. Lack of uniform diagnostic categories complicates things further.

We think it is reasonable, however, to characterize the population located by the centers as diverse both in degree of deaf/blindness and in the existence of other handicaps. We believe that the prevalence of other handicaps makes it as accurate to characterize the population as multiply handicapped as it is to characterize it as deaf/blind. We recognize, however, the complexities that deaf/blindness can add to

these other conditions and the special implications involved for education and services.

(7) Center program objectives and center activities match well in service to children.—A 1982 study of the centers by the American Institutes of Research found a good match between objectives and activities in (1) direct educational services, (2) indirect counseling/consulting services, and (3) training professionals in deaf/blind education. Since the study did not evaluate program effectiveness, little is indicated about the quality of these services or how well they meet needs. Implementation also is uncertain. The report does suggest that services and technical assistance are concentrated within a fairly narrow geographic area close to the centers themselves. The reason may be partly the co-location of some centers with State Departments of Education, since travel freezes on State employees may affect the staff of such centers. This is of some significance in light of the change from 15 to 6 centers.

(8) Program objectives and activities do not match well in development, demonstration, and dissemination.—The same American Institutes of Research study found that objectives and activities do not match in (1) developing and demonstrating new and improved methods for educating deaf/blind children and (2) disseminating effective practices and information. The Office of Special Education Programs has been expanding and centralizing these functions since 1978. In 1978, $1,000,000 was allocated for competitive awards for demonstrating effective ways to mainstream deaf/blind and other severely-handicapped children into least restrictive environments. A total of $3.7 million is expected for fiscal year 1983 for innovative program awards.

It is true that developing, demonstrating, and disseminating information on new, better, and effective ways to serve deaf/blind children is indeed an important function. And it is also true that many problems typically exist in planning, implementing, and evaluating demonstrations which have little to do with their locus or placement. That is, centralization and expansion of funds may not be panaceas for problems found in decentralized model or demonstration programs.

(9) It is not clear whether the centers purchase mostly direct service, indirect service, or technical assistance.—According to the Office of Special Education Programs, direct or subcontracted expenditures include the costs of diagnosis and evaluation, weekend and summer programs, tuition in residential private schools, workshops for teachers of the deaf/blind and similar services. Ten of the 13 centers for which data are available allocate about 70 percent or more of their budgets to subcontracted service. The centers' operational costs include rent, staff salaries and benefits, telephones and supplies, and similar charges. These categories seem to blur, however, and the readily available data do not allow us to focus them. For example, some centers may provide technical assistance through their own staff in which case it is carried under center operations and others may purchase all or some technical assistance services in which case it is carried as direct services. According to State coordinators of deaf/blind programs surveyed in 1982, most direct instructional services for school-age deaf/blind children are provided by Public Laws 94-142 and 89-313 and by State or local funds. The center resources are said to be used to supplement and enrich services to school-age children in important ways, and in some centers, to provide direct services to the children who are too young or too old to be eligible for State supported education. We have not, however, been able to find an adequate empirical base for these statements.

(10) The expenditure on services to each child is uncertain.—Per child expenditures are available as the total award to each center divided by the number of children located. The expenditure on services received by an individual child could be higher or lower by an unknown amount. A few children could have received services costing thousands of dollars while most children received relatively inexpensive services.

Centers vary considerably in "per child located costs." The highest is reported from the South Atlantic Center ($5,602 based on 252 children located with an award of $1,411,681). The lowest is from the South Central Center ($1,589 based on 694 children located with an award of $1,102,616). We are told that the national average cost of educational services to the deaf/blind child is about $11,000 with deaf/blind center funds paying for about 20 percent of the total. The variation in children's characteristics and other factors are likely to make the averages highly uninformative as a measure of allocation relative to need. The centers' budgets have remained relatively constant over the years, at about $15,600,000 for the total program and the numbers of children located have remained relatively constant, but inflation undoubtedly has increased considerably the costs of services. Most of a small sample of program directors and those serving deaf/blind children report that recent allocations have been "adequate" but express concern for the future.

SUMMARY

Published or readily available information about the children and the centers is incomplete. What there is, can be inconsistent and useful only with caution as approximations.

We believe, however, that the centers are serving most of the 1963-1965 rubella epidemic children who are deaf/blind to some degree. We know that about a third of these children will be ineligible for service beginning in 1985 and that all will become ineligible by the end of 1988.. Other children continue to be born or to become deaf/blind to some degree due to congenital rubella or to other causes. Their number annually is small, and we have no information indicating a dramatic decrease (or increase) in the near future. The centers seem to be providing direct and indirect service delivery and technical assistance corresponding reasonably to the congressional intent in these areas, but they do not seem to be meeting congressional intent with regard to development, demonstration, and dissemination functions.

This information suggests first, that there is a continuing need to provide services for a small, but severely handicapped group of young people and second, that there exists some uncertainty about the best ways to deliver services to them.

This concludes our statement. We would be pleased to explain any part of it or to answer any questions you may have.

STATEMENT OF DR. ELEANOR CHELIMSKY, DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION, U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, ACCOMPANIED BY LOIS-ELLIN DANTA

Dr. CHELIMSKY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, let me begin by introducing a person who is on my left here. She is Dr. Lois-Ellin Danta, and she's the group director at GAO's Institute for Program Evaluation, who has the responsibility for our educational studies.

We are really very pleased to be here today in response to the subcommittee's request to testify on what existing studies tell us about deaf-blind children and about the deaf-blind centers and services program. In order to heed the subcommittee's time constraints and need for brevity, we're presenting only the highlights of the attached, abbreviated statement of our findings, which means that the attached statement is a ministatement to begin with, so that makes this one a mini ministatement. But I would ask you, if you could, to put the full statement in the record.

Mr. MURPHY. Without objection, it shall be done.

Dr. CHELIMSKY. In a nutshell, then, based on our review of published evaluations and readily available national data, we make the following 13 points.

First, we found that information about the centers and the populations they serve is surprisingly sparse, is incomplete, and is inconsistent given the small number of centers, the small population sizes involved, and given also the number of years the centers are in existence.

Second, we feel this is a serious problem of information quality and it means that our numbers can best be considered and used as approximations.

The problem is illustrated by the fact, and this is a third point, that the actual number of deaf-blind children for the year 1982 is uncertain. It's a primitive sort of fact. It ranges from about 2,600 if you use the State reports from Public Laws 94-142 and 89-313 combined, to about 3,500, if you use the Registry for Deaf-Blind Children, to about 5,400, if you use reports from deaf-blind directors to

the office of special education programs. So, it ranges from 2,600 to 5,400, more than double.

The fourth point, we do find that most rubella epidemic deaf-blind children appear to have been located by the centers. We base that on the fact that there was a 1969 estimate that there would be 1,250 kids. We discovered that 1,360 have been identified, which looks like a good match.

Fifth, rubella epidemic children will, in fact, soon be ineligible for service, some in 1985, all by the end of 1988.

The sixth point, although we've had no further national rubella epidemics since 1965, it's important to remember that it's the case that congenital rubella still results in deaf-blindness. We measure that as approximately 15 to 110 children per birth year, as best estimated. That's what it is.

Seventh, between approximately 100 and 140 children per birth year are born or become deaf-blind due to causes other than congenital rubella, and we see that there are 55 causes that are listed as possible reasons for deaf-blindness in the Registry. One of the causes, is Usher's Syndrome.

The eighth point that we'd like to make is that deaf-blindness exists in different degrees with different definitions across the States. In one State, for example, the degree of blindness for the deaf-blind children includes about 36 percent of children who are what is called visually impaired, 21 percent who are legally blind—those that are the definitions that are given—20 percent with light perception only, and finally, 23 percent who are totally blind.

Deafness, in the same way, includes about 50 percent with mild or moderate hearing loss, and 50 percent with severe or profound hearing loss. So, there is a good deal of variation.

A ninth point, deaf-blind children are very often multiply handicapped. For those children for whom additional handicaps are reported, only about 24 percent are uniquely deaf-blind. Seventy-six percent have at least one additional handicap. So, it's not simply a problem of deaf-blindness.

Point 10, based on the data we reviewed, it seemed to us that center activities are pretty well matched to those center objectives that deal with direct educational services to children, counseling and consulting services, and training professionals in deaf-blind education. We're not saying that the services are successful. We're saying that they seem to be reasonable activities to fulfill the objectives that the centers have and that the Congress has mandated.

Because there are no evaluations of the effectiveness of the centers program, none, it precludes any discussion of the quality of the services.

On the other hand, and this is our point 11, center activities do not seem to be well matched at all with the center objectives for demonstration and dissemination, that is to develop new, better, and demonstrably effective ways to serve deaf-blind children. There seems to be no long-range plan for identifying what works, what doesn't work, and no plan for disseminating the information, if they had it.

Point 12, most centers seem to allocate most of their funds to subcontracts. But the distribution of center purchases is unclear

with respect to direct service, indirect service, and/or technical assistance.

Point 13, finally, our last point, the average expenditures per child range from about $1,600 to about $5,600, depending on the center. But the actual cost for each child is unknown.

That concludes the discussion of our highlights and, clearly, more detail is available in the attached statement. We'd be pleased to explain any part of that statement and answer any questions you may have, if you want to do that now or later for the record. Thank you.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Doctor.

Did you receive any information from your review of the deaf-blind program which includes what happens to the students after they attain age 18?

Dr. CHELIMSKY. No.

Mr. MURPHY. You received no information on that? Or did you receive information and find no facilities available?

Dr. CHELIMSKY. The problem that we had was that there were no—you must remember that what we looked at was nationally published data and evaluations. We did talk to people so we did have people tell us anecdotal information about what happens but we don't have good information about what the services are that are given, what is available. We don't really know that unless, Lois-Ellin you would like to add something to that.

Dr. DANTA. There don't seem to be, as Dr. Chelimsky noted, any followup studies nationally of the——

Mr. MURPHY. The centers do nothing in the way of following up, followup studies? You didn't find any of those?

Dr. DANTA. We were looking for the nationally published evaluations or readily available national data. Individual centers may but we could not find any nationally available studies on that question, very important question. We would very much agree that it is a lack, a gap, in our knowledge.

Mr. MURPHY. Do you have a sense of what changes in the program might improve the development, demonstration, and dissemination activities associated with the programs? Did you—were you able to come up with any conclusions that might help us?

Dr. CHELIMSKY. I think that's a very important question also. I think the thinking that needs to go into that about how you would design the demonstrations to find out what works and what doesn't work would be the first thing that I would worry about. We didn't find any evidence that that was occurring.

Our sense is that there are problems of organization which are often considered to be very important, such as whether they are centralized or whether they are decentralized, and things of that sort. I guess our experience with demonstrations is that what is really important is that one has a very clear idea of what one wants to find out from the demonstration. One designs the demonstration to find that out. One collects data so that you can determine whether, in fact, it occurred, and then you disseminate promising practices and you talk about them and we just aren't finding any of those activities.

It sounds terribly simple but maybe it isn't as simple as it sounds. But it needs to be done. So, I would caution you against structural changes as opposed to information-producing changes.

Would you like to add something to that?

Dr. DANTA. No, that's fine.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Williams, do you have any questions?

Mr. WILLIAMS. To use your words, this report is based on judgment calls rather than significant findings. Should the legislation or the administrators be requiring objectives and demonstrable products at the end of a year's time so that we do know and can identify the accomplishments of these efforts?

Dr. CHELIMSKY. I think that's the chief finding that I would like to communicate here. I am wondering what the basis can be for making decisions on a program where there isn't the most rudimentary basis, even to decide what the population is. I would agree with that wholeheartedly. Would you agree also, Lois-Ellin?

Dr. DANTA. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has that suggestion been made before?

Dr. CHELIMSKY. I have no idea. This is the very first time that I have gone into these data to this degree, with this kind of care. It may be the case that people have been telling you this for years. I don't know. I'm not aware of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With regard to the value to the clients of these services, is that value perceived differently by those who provide the services and the parents?

Dr. CHELIMSKY. We haven't done anything of that sort in this study. That would require the sort of thing we did on the runaway and homeless youth program, that we would go and ask and try to match.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I recall those results and they were very interesting.

Dr. CHELIMSKY. I remember when you asked me about inter-relater reliability. It made my week. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. My staff was delighted too. [Laughter.]

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MURPHY. Delighted that you remembered the question. Thank you, Mr. Williams.

It's been suggested by Ms. Morrissey that we ask if you would entertain our written questions at a subsequent date for the members who were unable to be with us, after they have reviewed your testimony, and also from our subcommittee staff?

Dr. CHELIMSKY. Oh, with great pleasure, Mr. Murphy.

Mr. MURPHY. Fine. Thank you very much, Doctors, for being with us.

The next panel of witnesses, Dr. Brian McNulty, supervisor of special education, Colorado Department of Education, and Dr. Philip Jones, from the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

Doctors, you may proceed.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Brian McNulty follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. BRIAN MCNULTY, SUPERVISOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD STATE COORDINATOR, COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Dr. Brian McNulty, supervisor of special education and the early childhood State coordinator with the Colorado Department of Education. while I am interested in all the proposed educational amendments before you, I am here today to speak specifically on section 623 regarding early education for handicapped children.

ARE PRESCHOOL SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS A SOUND INVESTMENT?

Recently in Colorado. we completed a study for the general assembly on the effectiveness of early intervention for children with handicaps. This study clearly documents that under both controlled research conditions and in regular public school settings that these programs are highly effective. To be more specific, I quote: "The results indicated that almost one-third of the handicapped children who received special education services through preschools for handicapped children were able to begin public schools in regular education with no special education services" (P. 5). The report goes on to say that "A survey of these student's current teachers revealed that approximately 40 percent of these youngsters were judged to be average or above average in reading, math and language arts" (P. 5). Finaliy, in analyzing the cost of providing these programs, it was determined that, over time, it actually costs school districts less to serve handicapped children in preschool programs than it does to wait until they enter school. In fact it was documented that after subtracting the actual cost of the preschool program, that in just two years, school districts save over $1,500 per handicapped child.

WHAT IS THE NEED FOR FEDERAL AND STATE LEADERSHIP?

Given these dramatic results, one might ask why are State and local education agencies experiencing such difficulty in developing and implementing these programs? While certainly a major part of this can be attributed to a declining resource base, much of the problem can also be ascribed to the need for more systemic changes. The provision of services to handicapped infants and preschool children requires not only new Federal, State, and local funding sources, but a different services delivery system. This new service delivery system requires a new leadership initiative on the part of the State Education Agency. To give an example, if we are going to implement appropriate services for preschool handicapped children then almost all the support service personnel currently employed in the public schools must be retrained in the areas of assessment and program planning for this population. Since, to date, most preservice training programs for personnel such as psychologists, speech/language therapists, PT's and OT's have focused only on the school aged handicapped child, these individuals do not feel qualified to work with this younger handicapped population. This concern must also be paired with the continuing need for more trained early childhood special education teachers and, consequently, the need for the development of new preservice teacher training programs. This, in turn, necessitates the development of program and certification standards by the state educational agency, as well as increased responsibilities in the areas of monitoring and technical assistance. Given this single example, you can begin to see the "domino effect" of how a single concern multiplies into numerous important issues.

While in the past ten years, we have witnessed a significant increase, the number of public programs serving young handicapped children and their families, limited attention has been given to systematically planning for this change. In a time of limited resources, we all must make the commitment to more effective and efficient long-range planning. The rational reallocation of responsibilities requires that careful attention and sufficient resources be given to finding new ways to access and integrate services across agencies for this population.

What you have before you today is such an initiative. The proposed legislation represents a comprehensive approach which will assist the States in the development and implementation of statewide services to young handicapped children and their families. It takes into consideration the fact that system-wide change requires time and planning, and allows the flexibility needed to address differences from State to State. More specifically, the current proposal outlines three types of grants aimed at assisting States which are in different stages of development. The first option, the planning grants, will assist States that currently have limited or no public services for preschool handicapped children. It will provide many of them

with their first opportunity to conduct a thorough assessment of the needs. Such questions as: Who is to be served? How many children are there? What services currently exist? What resources are needed and can be identified and addressed on a statewide basis? The development grants then provide States with the opportunity to develop a comprehensive state plan for addressing these needs. These plans can address which services are to be provided, who will provide them, and how they will be financed. In addition, the plans can detail the cooperative working relationships between agencies. These plans will provide States with the ability to adequately plan for the statewide provision of services to this young handicapped population. Finally, the implementation grants assist States in implementing and evaluating the plan of statewide services. This will allow States to pilot, evaluate, and modify the components of the plan and therefore ensure its effectiveness. Let me close by saying that, although the benefits of early intervention are becoming more and more evident, assistance is still needed in developing appropriate service delivery systems for these children and their families. If States are to take the leadership role, they must move from a reactive to a proactive position. Clearly, this current initiative provides them with such an incentive.

I appreciate the opportunity to present you with my views and have included a copy of our efficacy study for your review. I look forward to continuing this joint Federal-State partnership and toward working with the subcommittee in its efforts to assist States in serving all handicapped children.

STATEMENT OF A PANEL OF WITNESSES: DR. BRIAN McNULTY, SUPERVISOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD STATE COORDINATOR, COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; AND DR. PHILIP JONES, PROFESSOR AND COORDINATOR, ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

Dr. McNULTY. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Dr. Brian McNulty of the Colorado Department of Education. I have submitted my written testimony for your review, so I'd like to deviate just a bit from that to highlight several statements. One is on the efficacy of early intervention and the second is on the capacity of States to develop statewide programs for preschool handicapped children.

We have just completed a recent report for the Colorado General Assembly that looks at the efficacy of early intervention in public preschool programs, I think one of the very first studies in the country that really looks at public school programs.

And there are three or four results that I think are important for your review. One is that in both controlled research settings and in the public school we had similar kinds of findings and one was that when we identify young handicapped children at the preschool level, and if we don't intervene with them, that those same children are identified again in elementary school as handicapped and 100 percent of them end up in special-education.

So, I think that the age-old erroneous conception that children outgrow their handicaps has certainly been disproven once and for all.

The second major point, I think, was that when we did intervene with children at age 3, in a variety of settings, urban, rural, home-based programs, center-based programs, it didn't seem to matter, that the results were similar and that those results included: Approximately 30 percent of the kids were able to enter regular education with no special education services and to remain in regular education. Another third of those students were able to go into regular education with support services. So that we saw a very large

shift of children. When we didn't intervene, 100 percent ended up in special education. When we did intervene, approximately 30 percent of those went right into regular education and stayed there.

When we looked at the cost factor of how much did it cost us to serve those children in public school programs, and how much did it cost us to serve those children who did not receive those programs later on, we found that after subtracting actual cost of providing those preschool programs, that those programs had already paid for themselves by the time those children were in second grade.

As a matter of fact, we actually found that we had actually made about $1,500 per child, per handicapped child, once we had subtracted out the cost of the preschool programs.

So, we felt that the programs were very, very effective, not only programmaticwise in terms of child progress, in terms of their ability to benefit from regular education, but also in terms of costs to the taxpayer.

The third point, I guess, was that when we surveyed parents and said: "How did you feel about the programs? Did you feel the programs were effective?" Overwhelmingly, their answer to us was yes. On top of that there was a side benefit that they felt that the programs had assisted the families and had supported the families in their having a handicapped child.

So, overall the effectiveness results, I think, were somewhat startling to us in terms of the amount and benefit of the programs.

The second point I'd like to make is in regard to the question: Are States equipped and ready to really serve this population of young, handicapped children? And although we have got a wealth, I think now, of research information around what kind of programs are effective and models, States are finding it very difficult to make the transition from what we have done in research to what we need to do in public school programs, which are somewhat different than research settings.

Also in terms of volume, on the numbers of kids that we serve, the variety of facilities that we serve kids in, and we're serving children, again, in rural settings and urban settings, in home-based programs. All of those are different kinds of programs for public schools. So that we have had to really look at developing an entirely new service-delivery system which adequately meets the needs of families and young handicapped children. Serving infants is categorically different than serving a secondary-age student. So that the ability for the public schools to adapt to those new kinds of programs has been very, very difficult for them.

So, I think we're having trouble making that jump and what is recommended to the committee, in your proposal, section 623, is a new proposal which would assist States, then, in planning for how do they adapt their entire system, how do we look at establishing new State legislation, new funding in terms of State funding, how do we look at establishing new kinds of facilities, new standards, teacher-training programs? The list really goes on and on and on in terms of how States need to adapt in order to adequately meet the needs of young, handicapped children.

I think States are trying to make that jump but I think that they're finding it very, very difficult because they don't have the

planning capacity to really look at where are these children, who are currently serving them, how can we best utilize the services that are already available in communities, how can we use other agency providers in cooperation with public school providers? So, I would just ask that you give that serious consideration.

I have included our study for inclusion in the record and I'd be available for any comments.

Mr. MURPHY. Without objection, your entire statement as well as your study will be admitted into the record, Doctor. Thank you.

Dr. Jones.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Philip R. Jones follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PHILIP R. JONES, ED. D., PROFESSOR AND COORDINATOR, ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY, BLACKSBURG, VA.

Chairman Murphy and members of the subcommittee, it is indeed a pleasure to appear before you today as you consider the reauthorization of the discretionary programs under the Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA).

The Commission on the Financing of a Free and Appropriate Education for Special Needs Children deliberated many hours on the topic of discretionary programs under EHA. The Commission findings and recommendations provide strong support for The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142) and the current regulatory structure. We firmly believe that the discretionary programs you are considering today have been and will continue to be required as we move more closely to full implementation of Public Law 94-142.

Specifically, Commission Recommendation VI states "Congress and the Department of Education should target a portion of current discretionary resources to encourage SEAs and LEAs to use more effective administrative policies and practices" (p. 2 commission report). To amplify this recommendation such targeting should encourage state and local education agencies to develop and implement:

"Policies which establish more flexible regular education programs; policies which limit or assign appropriate financial responsibility; practices which bring into existence the long sought after interagency collaboration; strategies to encourage the growth of community-based residential alternatives; and practices which reduce unnecessary conflict-related expenses" (p. 27, commission report).

Recommendation IX states "The Federal government should fully fund the EHA discretionary program to support research, training, model development, and dissemination programs which together work to ensure that every handicapped child receives an appropriate education" (p. 29, commission report). Our 16 Commissioners firmly believe that we have made great progress throughout the nation since the enactment of Public Law 94-142. The majority of the handicapped have been identified and now have access to a free, appropriate public education. Thus we are nearing procedural compliance with the statute. Such procedural compliance has resulted in "quantitative" strides, such as numbers of teachers employed, numbers of handicapped children enrolled, number of personnel preparation programs in institutions of higher education. Our concern focused on whether current educational programs and services are appropriate for the children who have been identified as handicapped. Appropriate deals more with a "qualitative" dimension and we firmly believe that the EHA discretionary programs are those which build the qualitative capacity of state and local education agencies.

The Commission found the following barriers to the achievement of the "appropriateness" goal:

"The inadequacy of current diagnostic procedures and limited use of state-of-the-art instructional technologies;

"A lack of well-equipped personnel, including classroom teachers, to handle the range of special needs presented by children, the shortage of specialists (e.g., physical therapists, occupational therapists, and speech clinicians), and the lack of programs to equip parents with the knowledge and skills they need to be full partners in the planning and conduct of their child's education; and

"A limited capacity among Federal and state personnel to provide technical assistance and dissemination programs to school districts" (p. 32, commission report).

Current Federal discretionary programs are designed to address these kinds of needs and in order to achieve the intended goals of Public Law 94-142, ongoing programs of research, training, model development and dissemination must be contin-

ued. The Report of the Commission states: "Such a program needs to be a balanced one; on the one hand, supporting research and development aimed at increasing knowledge and understanding of specific handicaps, and at developing more effective educational practices, and on the other hand, supporting training and dissemination activities which develop local capability to provide the most appropriate education which current knowledge and practice allow" (p. 33).

In my role as a professor I feel it is very appropriate to comment on reauthorization of Part D for Training of Personnel and Part E for Research and Demonstration Projects. I am currently director of two personnel preparation projects under Part D and one student-initiated research grant under Part E. Also from a personal standpoint I was a recipient of a Federal fellowship to complete the doctorate in administration of special education at the University of Illinois in 1965–66. Without that Federal support, it is doubtful that I would have been able to take leave from my position having served for five years as a teacher of the mentally retarded and five years as a supervisor of programs for the mentally retarded. Since the receipt of that fellowship, I have been employed as a director of special education in an Illinois school district for three years, a trainer of doctoral level administrators of special education at Indiana University for seven years; an assistant state superintendent and administrator of the division for Handicapped Children in the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction for two years; and have now completed six years as a trainer of doctoral level administrators and supervisors of special education at Virginia Tech. Both the Indiana and Virginia Tech programs received program support grants under Part D and the over 80 graduates from those programs with whom I worked currently hold leadership positions in public school, state residential facilities, state education agencies, professional organizations, private agencies, and institutions of higher learning in 22 states and Puerto Rico. Certainly the investment of Federal funds in my education and that of these program graduates have been felt throughout the country. These statistics are only those from my own personal knowledge in administration and supervision of special education and do not include statistics from the approximately 800 personnel preparation projects currently funded throughout the nation.

The language you have incorporated in the bill for reauthorization of Part D will allow these personnel preparation programs to continue to produce qualified teachers, administrators, and researchers to work toward the quality education for handicapped children envisioned in 1975. Shortages still exist in certain specialized areas and in certain geographical regions of the country.

I was pleased to see the inclusion of language to allow the Department of Education to make grants under a separate competition to provide training and information to parents of handicapped children and volunteers. Certainly a variety of approaches should be utilized to better inform parents of rights and responsibilities leading to improved educational programs for their child. Many local and state education agencies have undertaken projects to meet the information needs of parents and volunteers. Unfortunately not all states and localities have done so and parents in those areas lack the information necessary to appropriately access the educational planning and delivery of service functions needed for their children. My observations from around the country would suggest that such parent training and information programs are needed the most in rural areas where other agencies are not available to meet the information needs of parents.

In reviewing the sections of the reauthorization bill relating to Part E, Research and Demonstration, I was pleased to see continuation of this program. This discretionary program certainly is the one that looks to the future in development of new knowledge and improved techniques. One small portion of this program which has resulted in solid improvements of our capability to provide more meaningful programs and services for the handicapped learner is the student-initiated research competition. Virginia Tech currently is the recipient of two awards to support student research. One of the grants is developing cost models for local school districts to utilize in determining the comparative costs of public and private school options for handicapped children. The other grant is supporting student research aimed at analyzing state special education finance systems and determining what factors within the various systems utilized today tend to enhance and/or inhibit program development at the LEA level. Obviously both of these projects have administrative orientations given the nature of our preparation program. Generally such student research grants are funded at $10,000 or less and their products have rather immediate application.

The whole area of technological advancement in the education of the handicapped has received support under this program. Many more applications of technology appear likely given the support of research and demonstration funds authorized by

the bill under consideration today. Whether field initiatives in open competition or targeted competitions are utilized the research program has had major impact on programs for handicapped learners. As is always the case in research and development activities, dissemination must follow to allow the knowledge gained to translate into state-of-the art practice. Such dissemination is incorporated into the language of the bill under consideration.

Other reactions to the bill under consideration seem to be appropriate at this time. The designation of an Office of Special Education Programs to be headed by a Deputy Assistant Secretary will hopefully clarify the rapidly changing designations encountered since the creation of the Department of Education. The three different titles used in the recent past (BEH, OSE, and SEP) have been confusing to professionals and presumably even more confusing to parents and others with an interest in special education.

The inclusion of attention to post-secondary and transitional programs is a naturally evolving and necessary section. It is most appropriate to address the needs of handicapped persons who exceed the upper age limits of Public Law 94-142. Many government officials and professionals at all levels have expressed concern about the handicapped learner who needs additional education, training, or services beyond secondary school programs, and this section certainly begins to address such concerns.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee today and offer my appreciation of your wisdom in proposing the reauthorization of the discretionary program under the Education of the Handicapped Act. These programs are indeed necessary as we continue to work toward the full implementation of Public Law 94-142.

Dr. JONES. Thank you, Chairman Murphy and members of the subcommittee. I come here in two roles today. As you indicated, a member of the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and for Governor Robb's benefit, and State University, which is our official title. Virginia Tech is the way we refer to it. I'll have some comments later from that context.

More importantly—possibly not more importantly, but certainly with more than just one individual's somewhat biased views sometimes, I had the privilege of serving as the chairman of the Commission on the Financing of a Free and Appropriate Education for Special Needs Children, which of course, you're deeply aware, Chairman Murphy, and we certainly appreciated your wisdom in convening that kind of a panel.

That was a very interesting experience, I must say. Our 16 commissioners represented higher education, research, public schools, professional organizations, State legislators, State boards of education, and so on. So just the fact that that kind of a group, while I say I chaired it, sometimes I felt I was refereeing—the fact that we could come out with a report and some recommendations that we could all subscribe to, I think, does give that some degree of validity.

The Commission on the Financing of Free and Appropriate Public Education for Special Needs Children's findings and recommendations did have many references in relation to the discretionary programs that you are considering today. We firmly believe that the discretionary programs have been and will continue to be required as we move more closely to full implementation of Public Law 94-142.

We see them as very much in concert with each other and certainly the discretionary programs have been around longer, but indeed, they are possibly even more necessary today than they were at the outset.

Commission recommendation six states, and I apologize for reading some of this, but I think we need to get the full emphasis of what the Commission said, and I quote:

> Congress and the Department of Education should target a portion of current discretionary resources to encourage State education agencies and local education agencies to use more effective administrative policies and practices.

That recommendation was actually amplified a little bit in the report, and again I quote: "Policies which establish more flexible regular education programs," and we feel that the regular education programs haven't been flexible enough in many instances to account for youngsters who might otherwise be identified as handicapped.

Again I go back into the quote:

> Policies which limit or assign appropriate financial responsibility, practices which bring into existence the long sought after inter-agency collaboration, strategies to encourage the growth of community-based residential alternatives, and practices which reduce unnecessary conflict-related expenses.

Recommendation nine from the Commission states:

> The federal government should fully fund the EHA discretionary program to support research, training, model development, and dissemination programs which together work to ensure that every handicapped child receives an appropriate education.

The Commission, in the deliberations, found that, indeed, we have made great progress since 1975 when Public Law 94–142 was passed. We viewed primarily that progress as quantitative. We know there are greater numbers of handicapped children being served. We know there are greater numbers of teachers employed in special education. We know there are more personnel preparation programs and so on, and certainly Congress has seen fit to appropriate more dollars. We appreciate all of those things.

However, the Commission in deliberations decided that we really weren't sure about the appropriateness or the qualitative dimension of some of the programs that are covered under the authorization bill you're considering today. The discretionary programs that you do consider are really those factors that can lead to the quality in educational programing for handicapped youngsters that we express concern about.

The Commission found the following barriers in existence to achievement of the appropriateness goal. And again I quote:

> The inadequacy of current diagnostic procedures and limited use of state of the art instructional technologies, a lack of well-equipped personnel, including classroom teachers, to handle the range of special needs presented by children, the shortage of specialists like physical therapists, occupational therapists, and speech clinicians, and the lack of programs to equip parents with the knowledge and skills they need to be full partners in the planning and conduct of their child's education and, finally, a limited capacity among federal and state personnel to provide technical assistance and dissemination programs to school districts.

And Brian, I must say, we weren't talking about you there when we said "limited capacity."

Current discretionary programs and those that you are considering today certainly address those kinds of needs, and in order to achieve the ongoing and intended goals of Public Law 94–142 programs of research, training, and model development and dissemination must be continued.

The Commission report also states:

> Such a program needs to be a balanced one, on the one hand supporting research and development aimed at increasing knowledge and understanding of specific handicaps, and at developing more effective educational practices, and on the other hand, supporting training and dissemination activities which develop local capability to provide the most appropriate education which current knowledge and practice allow.

I'll shift out of my role as a Commission member now for a little bit and speak as a professor. In my role, certainly, I have a very great interest in part D, the personnel preparation, and part E, for research and demonstration projects. I currently direct two personnel preparation projects under part D, and one student-initiated research grant under part E.

Also, from a personal standpoint, very probably I would not be here today had I not received a Federal fellowship kind of back in late medieval/early renaissance period, as I recall, but specifically in 1965–66 and that Federal fellowship of some $2,800 at that time allowed me to go ahead and complete doctoral work at the University of Illinois. It's doubtful I could have done that at that point in time, having served as an administrator in an Illinois school district and also having a family to provide for.

Since I received that fellowship, I've had 3 years as a special education director in Illinois, 7 as a trainer of administrators and supervisors of special education in Indiana, at Indiana University, 2 years as assistant State superintendent of the State of Wisconsin, and head of the Division for Handicapped Children in the State education agency which also included the usual special education staff, crippled children service program, or title V of the Social Security Act, the old program when I was there, and also the State schools for the deaf and the visually handicapped.

I have now completed 6 years again as an administrator trainer at Virginia Tech. Possibly that investment has been spread throughout the country and may, indeed, for $3,000 I sure traveled a lot in terms of getting around this country.

Indiana and Tech, both training programs in administration and supervision of special education, have benefited from program support grants under part D, and with the 7 years at IU and now the 6 at Tech, we've had some 80 doctoral and specialist degree graduates. They are currently employed in 22 States and Puerto Rico and they're found in positions of leadership and LEA's, SEA's, public and private residential programs, professional organizations, private agencies, and while we strongly discourage our administrative graduates to go into higher education, indeed some of them are there.

One of them is a director of the UAF and another is a trainer of administrators and supervisors in the State of South Dakota.

So, the Federal investment in that program, I think, has been shown to actually benefit folks from around the country.

Most recently, as of August 1, one of our students from Indiana who graduated some years back, is moving from a directorship in northeastern Wisconsin to Galveston, Tex. I'm sorry Mr. Bartlett has left the room. We've touched his State now. And as of August 1, one of our current students, who is within a couple weeks of defending dissertation, will be accepting the director of special educa-

tion position in a board of cooperative educational services in Wyoming and Gennessee County in New York. So, we're sorry Mr. Biaggi isn't here today, too.

But those are two of our most recent States that we have moved into with our graduates.

Certainly these are only from my personal knowledge, which I have the best information on, in terms of personnel preparation programs. But I think the results that I can give to you from those programs, as I've just done in statistics, would be magnified some 800 times over for the approximate number of personnel preparation projects that exist today.

Certainly we know there are still shortages in certain areas of the country for certain types of trained individuals and certain specific areas that do need additional attention. Teachers of severely and profoundly handicapped would be one example. The other, clinicians that I mentioned, would certainly be another example.

The language that you have included in this reauthorization bill would allow part B to continue and I feel still make a major impact in terms of moving away from the shortages that we're finding. We still have many untrained teachers serving in programs for handicapped children, which is not, in my estimation, the best way and certainly we may have the quantity with the number of youngsters enrolled, but we don't have the qualitative program that I really think you envisioned when Public Law 94-142 was passed.

I was pleased to see the inclusion of the language in the bill to allow the Department of Education to make grants to—for the training and information to parents of handicapped children and volunteers under competition. There are a variety of approaches, however, that can be taken in this way.

As I look around the country, I've seen many State education agencies and local education agencies doing some outstanding parent training and information programs. They are actually informing the parents of their rights and also of their responsibilities. Not all LEA's and SEA's have behaved in that manner. However, I do think it's their responsibility under the Education of the Handicapped Act to do so.

Unfortunately, since they don't, there is a need for parent information and training and I think that the flexibility of the language that you have included here will allow that to happen.

There appears to be, from my estimation, a greater need many times in the rural areas where their agencies are not available, to provide the information as to how to access this program in the local schools.

There is a tendency to look at more urban or metropolitan areas and I think we've overlooked a particular clientele. I'm also not sure that many of the lower income groups are receiving specific information in this regard.

So, as this portion of the bill would go through I would certainly hope that there would be attention given to those things.

In looking at the sections on research, I am pleased to see the continuation of the program and I indicated that Virginia Tech currently does have one award that I direct under the student-initiated research program and we also have another student-initiated research grant. One of them is looking at the comparative costs

and developing a model for comparing the comparative costs of private and public education of handicapped youngsters. That's one that the Commission debated long and hard, as you recall, Chairman Murphy.

The second one is looking at the various state financed systems in terms of supporting special education programs, analyzing those systems, looking at the facilitating factors and, indeed, some of the inhibiting factors, as they exist, in State funding formulas, in terms of progress toward education of all handicapped children.

Both of those received less than $10,000 under the research program and I think the payoff from either one of them, while they're very heavily administrative oriented, will, indeed, have great benefit around the country. Again, that's just an example from personal knowledge. The whole area of technological advancement in the education of handicapped kids, since I started in this game in 1952, just blows my mind, having directed programs for deaf youngsters as the director of special education in Champaign, Ill. I now look at the technological advances in that field and I just can't even believe it's the same field. The same would be true with education of blind youngsters.

Certainly we need to continue the research program to allow for those kinds of advances, the development of better technology, development of better practices, and more importantly, your bill as you have it before you, does emphasize the dissemination, which is so critical, to take the research from the laboratory, or from the setting where it was conducted, out into the country and make it have the payoff for kids.

Inclusion of attention to postsecondary and transitional programs is certainly one that was bound to evolve and it's necessary. We have an upper age limit, obviously, on Public Law 94-142, and there are additional things that can be done for individuals beyond that age. So, I commend you for addressing that concern. There are many Government officials and local education officials that have expressed this throughout the country, and I would also say that probably there should be some of the research emphasis in this area.

In looking at other sections of the bill, I'd like to commend you for a couple of the definitions that you have included here, for example, striking out the "seriously emotionally disturbed" title which has a very negative connotation in many, many situations, and substituting "behaviorally disordered" and maintaining the same definition, I think, would be a real step forward.

Also by inserting the words "educational" before "needs" so the phrasing would be "unique educational needs" as opposed to "unique needs" as currently exists. Again, that's something that the Commission focused on and certainly I think that will help clarify that we're talking about educational needs of youngsters in terms of those unique needs.

Many times that's created confusion.

I think Brian did an excellent job on the preschool. I'd just say that we have a preschool technical assistance center for teachers in southwest Virginia at Virginia Tech. It's a method that the State of Virginia, or Commonwealth of Virginia, has used to assist in that area in its allocation of Federal funds to those centers. And

we're out there working with the teachers, with some of the funds that you're talking about under this reauthorization bill, and seeing great payoff for it.

I appreciate the opportunity to be with you. I appreciated working on the Commission and I commend you for your wisdom, really, that you've shown in preparing this bill.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Doctor. I personally want to thank you for your service on the Commission and all of the members of the Commission. I think they performed a great service to our educational community.

Dr. McNulty, I just have one question to ask you. Could you very briefly describe the services that are currently provided to handicapped youngsters in Colorado at the preschool age, between birth and 5? And do you have the cooperation of the local mental health agencies in this regard? What do you do for the preschool and how do you coordinate that with any other department?

Dr. MCNULTY. We have services currently being provided by two or three major providers. The public school is one major provider. Developmental disabilities, which for us falls under a Department of Institutions, is a second major provider. And then the third provider would be Head Start programs. All three of those programs are operating within our State.

Mr. MURPHY. Have you had any curtailment of the Head Start program in the last year or so? Have you had any problems?

Dr. MCNULTY. We've had curtailment of all of our programs. Most of the programs are supported with local and State dollars, obviously, and although we have been fairly protected from the recession to date, during the past year even we have felt the recession hit our programs and we have lost support service personnel, and probably more so than anything, I think what we've seen start happening is the dropping away of services from other agencies, particularly the Department of Health.

So that when we start looking, I think, and that question came up before, at child nutrition programs, and at well baby clinics, and we looked at the support services that the programs usually accessed as a part of their program, we have seen a curtailment of those services which then, I think, puts an additional burden on the program to try and really be all things to all people. And that has been, I think, the toughest part for our programs, is they have really lost some of their technical expertise around the medical areas, around nutrition, around health services, and around support services for parents and families.

Mr. MURPHY. OK, thank you, Doctor.

Dr. Jones, I have one question for you and perhaps you can give us some advice. We've had in many school districts, particularly in the Northeast where we're cutting back on the number of classes, we've had teachers who are furloughed or reduced in number, and we found that in some school districts they would take a teacher who is lower on seniority and reassign them to teach math and sometimes to teach special education.

Can they be retrained? Can they be readily adapted into the special education field? How long does it take to retrain them? Have you done any studies in this, in the personnel reassignment area?

Dr. JONES. Personnel reassignment is a major issue. I'm aware, of course, that in many States, negotiated contracts with boards of education do come into play here in terms of seniority. However, I think there's an override there in terms of people being reassigned for those positions for which they are legally certified by the State education agency certification offices. Very possibly the States need to police this in some indications where a secondary English or social studies teacher might be reassigned to teach preschool, severely retarded youngsters. That would not be, in my estimation, a very good match.

On the other hand, could that secondary English teacher or social studies teacher be retrained or "retooled," if you choose to use that terminology, to work with such a population? I think a lot of it would depend on the willingness of the individual, to start out. Certainly those individuals would need to be willing to go back into a training program.

More importantly, I think they could be trained. In many instances you're talking about the potential of an additional year's service in higher education courses to pick up the required certification that would be necessary. Some States have moved to a provisional certification wherein a teacher who has 3 to 9 hours, depending on the State we're talking about, in special education, can be assigned with a provisional certificate with the understanding that they, indeed, will go on and complete the training within a certain specified period of time.

Speaking from the standpoint of Virginia, and I suppose this is a negative for Virginia, we have too many provisionally certified special-education teachers that I'm not sure it's being policed, but indeed they are continuing in their education. I don't know that that would ever happen in the great State of Colorado, but it possibly could, and of course, one of the problems is, again, you get into this seniority bind in a negotiated contract.

But I do think the statutes pretty well override that. You need to be legally certified to provide that special education under Public Law 94-142.

Mr. MURPHY. I guess what's happening, though, is the provisional certification is thwarting that and then comes the conflict does the teacher then take a leave of absence, paid or unpaid, for a year? It would seem to me it would take them clearly a year to prepare to go from teaching English literature to handicapped youngsters.

Dr. JONES. I picked a very extreme example. If we were talking about working with secondary, educable, retarded youngsters or possibly behaviorally disordered youngsters, that English teacher or social studies teacher at the secondary level would not have as difficult a time in making that transition. I shouldn't have picked the example I picked.

Mr. MURPHY. You've got to guess how long it would take to retool them?

Dr. JONES. Well, I think, again, we're talking, you know, to really do the job right, probably an additional year. By the time they did serve a practicum or internship kind of arrangement, or student teaching arrangement in that new field, which I think is critical——

Mr. MURPHY. Well, that's not too long.

Dr. JONES. No, that's not too long.

Mr. MURPHY. In the professional life of the teacher.

Dr. JONES. And, of course, we're seeing fewer and fewer special education graduates each year for the last several years, according to the statistics from the Department of Education. We know our field is subject to burnout. We have, possibly, a higher turnover rate. So, we do have great needs for personnel.

Normally, you know, I suppose I would say that I was glad to see a shift to preservice training in the administration of part D, although it almost went too far. We'd had a significant allocation of inservice training in prior years and in this last year's competition we went almost exclusively to preservice and possibly this pendulum went a little too far, Mr. Murphy.

Mr. MURPHY. OK; thank you very much.

Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dr. McNulty, is early intervention more cost effective—rather, cost beneficial—when applied to the moderately or severely handicapped than when applied to the at-risk or mildly handicapped child?

Dr. MCNULTY. That's an interesting question and it's one that we actually did try to address in our study, to look at how—what was the level of severity of the children when they started the programs and what kind of a shift in terms of their severity level did we see as they left the program.

I think that what we saw was that there was—the benefit was across all severity levels, that we did see a shift in terms of children who were classified as severely handicapped into the moderate ranges and from the moderate ranges into the mild ranges and from the mild ranges into regular education, and we did see that shift across all severity levels, and we did try and look and say: "What does that mean?" and we also tried to look at: "Does that change from categorical condition to categorical condition?"

Certainly when we looked at individuals who were deaf, they were always going to be deaf. And we couldn't change that, so that they may still need, and did need, services in special education. So, it was difficult when you talk about different categories, also, to say that a child moved from being profoundly deaf to mildly deaf. We obviously couldn't see that kind of a change.

So, it varied from handicapping condition to condition, I guess, is the way I would have to qualify that. But we did see a benefit for all children in terms of the restrictiveness of their placements. They moved from more severe to less restrictive placements, across the board.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Are you indicating to me that you measured whether the handicapped children moved to a new level of lesser handicap?

Dr. MCNULTY. We couldn't really judge that too much except by what level of services were they receiving, then, later on? So, we tried to really look at two issues. One was how were they, in terms of their current assessments? Were they diagnosed as mild, moderate, or severe? And No. 2, we tried to also look at what was the

restrictiveness of the setting? Were they in regular-education settings or were they in self-contained special-education settings?

We tried to look at both of those factors.

And we actually saw a shift in both factors. They moved to less restrictive settings and we did see a decrease in the severity. Now again, I would have to qualify that to say that we only saw that in certain conditions. Certainly in the area of emotional-behavioral conditions we saw that.

Certainly in the area of when we saw kids who were significantly delayed in language, we saw that kind of a shift. It was difficult to look at the area of cognition and to say that a child was functioning at one level and they moved to a higher level of cognitive function. The kids' adaptive behavior certainly were there. They were performing better.

When we did a final assessment of all of the children, we tried to look at how would their current teachers rate them in terms of academic performance. One of the findings that we did see was that over—the teachers rated over 40 percent of the kids who had received preschool special-education programs as now functioning on that either average or above average performance in terms of reading, math, and language arts. So, we saw an increase in academic performance and we saw an increase in less restrictive placements. And that was the way we judged that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the report of Secretary Bell's National Commission on Excellence there's a statement of overblown rhetoric which is, and I'm not quoting it directly now, but I think I'm pretty close, that says if a foreign power had required America to accept the educational system it now has, we might view it as an act of war. That report dealt primarily with high school education.

With regard to education for our handicapped citizens, is this Nation at risk?

Dr. MCNULTY. That's putting me right on the line. I would say that handicapped children are always at risk and they are at risk certainly more than the general population in terms of an opportunity to fully participate in the American system, and that, therefore, they are at risk because by not being given every opportunity to reach their potential, we limit their ability to fully participate as a citizen of this country.

And so I would interpret your question, then, to say are we doing everything that we can in terms of educating the handicapped children in this country? I would certainly say no. We certainly still see children not receiving the full range of services that they need, not just that they could benefit from but that they actually need. That's due to lack of personnel. It's due to lack of fiscal resources. It's due to an inability to be able to get people to very rural areas of our States.

There are multiple reasons that children are not getting these services, and I guess I would say for those children, yes, they are at risk.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Dr. Jones, is this Nation at risk because of its inadequate attention to the educational needs of special children?

Dr. JONES. Is the Nation at risk?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Dr. JONES. That's a different twist. I wasn't prepared for that twist. I think it probably is and had I answered your first question I'd have said yes and no. There are some 16,000 school districts, as I recall, throughout the country, and we have some 50 States, and in some of those areas yes, very clearly the education of the handicapped children and handicapped children are at risk and I think the Nation, indeed, is at risk, as you phrase it that way. Because without the support for programs for the handicapped and full access to the full range of services to which the youngsters are entitled, I think that we are at risk with social programs that are just going to continue on and on and on in terms of welfare programs for these youngsters, residential programs which are high cost, will continue to be high cost.

We've made progress. We've made progress in some States, in most States. I'm not sure we've made as much progress in other States and within local school districts, within both of those categories of States. Some of them are doing a pretty good job and some of them really aren't trying to do very much for handicapped kids. I think we are at risk both for handicapped kids and as a nation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams.

Thank you, Dr. Jones, Dr. McNulty. On behalf of the committee, we greatly appreciate your attendance here this morning and your indulgence of our schedule and waiting and testifying. You've provided a great deal of insight and I want to say to all the witnesses this morning, they have provided some very valuable testimony. This is the only preliminary hearing we're going to conduct before markup of this bill by the subcommittee, H.R. 3435. So, your testimony is rather exclusive, although we did hold extensive hearings last year.

We intend to mark up the bill before subcommittee next Thursday, July 21, in this room at 11 o'clock, for any persons who are interested.

Thank you very much for your participation. We stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the subcommittee recessed until 11 o'clock, July 21, 1983.]

[Material supplied for the record follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF KATHLEEN M. ROY, POLICY ASSOCIATE

INTRODUCTION

United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., is pleased to submit written testimony to the House Subcommittee on Select Education concerning H.R. 3435, the "Education of the Handicapped Amendments of 1984." Since the enactment of P.L. 94-142, the "Education for All Handicapped Children Act," handicapped children have begun to be served by our nation's public school systems. Prior to the enactment of this legislation, many UCP affiliates had provided special education and related services to handicapped children, many of whom had been excluded from our nation's school system. Because children with cerebral palsy often have severe, multiple disabilities, we have been in a unique position to evaluate the progress of special education over the last several years. We believe that special education has made great strides in recent years toward meeting the needs of these children. But we also believe that certain areas of special education require further concentration in order to fully meet the needs of disabled children. The Education of the Handicapped Act discretionary programs offer an opportunity to increase effort in those areas of special education which need further exploration. In a sense, the Education of the Handi-

capped Act can be seen as a catalyst for improving special education throughout our nation. UCPA is therefore pleased to comment on those sections of H.R. 3435 which we feel will improve the provision of special education to handicapped children.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND PRESCHOOL INITIATIVES

Since our agency was founded, we have been deeply concerned with providing services to young, handicapped children. Study after study has indicated the critical importance of early diagnosis and intervention with young handicapped children. Indeed, if children with cerebral palsy and other developmental disabilities receive services early in their lives, the effects of their handicapping conditions may be significantly reduced. Therefore it is not surprising that many UCP affiliates have provided, and continue to provide, services to these very young children. In order to stimulate activity in this area, UCPA was given a three-year grant in 1971, by the then Bureau of Education for the Handicapped to develop the Nationally Organized Project to Provide Comprehensive Services for Atypical Infants. The purpose of this project was to train both professionals and parents to work with young children with handicapping conditions. Through the efforts of this project, several infant development programs were started throughout the country. Many of these programs continue to provide quality services to young disabled children and their families. Another positive outcome of this project was the development of the transdisciplinary approach to educating children with developmental disabilities. Through the transdisciplinary approach, professionals from various disciplines work together to assure that all of the child's developmental needs are adequately met. The transdisciplinary approach is often used today. But, in the early seventies, bringing together several different professionals to focus on the needs of a single child was a revolutionary idea. UCPA is proud that we have been able to promote a process which has assured that many young children have received the services which they need in order to reach their full potential.

We have mentioned these accomplishments not to boast, but to demonstrate UCPA's longstanding commitment to meeting the needs of young handicapped children. While many significant contributions have been made in this area, we are keenly aware that much more must be done for these children. We are pleased that H.R. 3435 begins to address many of the unmet needs of these young children. For example, section 623 of the bill, "Early Education for Handicapped Children," has been significantly expanded. This section establishes a grant program which will enable states, through their state education agencies, to plan, develop, and implement a comprehensive delivery system for providing preschool services for handicapped children from birth through five years of age. In developing this plan, the state agency must with other public agencies which are involved in the provision of services to young children with disabilities, such as Head Start and the Developmental Disabilities Program. UCPA strongly supports this new initiative because we firmly believe that it will encourage states to give indepth consideration to the unmet needs of these young handicapped children. We would recommend that state agencies be encouraged to work with private, non-profit agencies who have expertise in this area. Many UCP affiliates across the country would willingly contribute their time and expertise to assist in the development of a comprehensive state plan for these children. Many of our sister agencies also have experience in this area which could prove invaluable to state agencies in developing these plans.

Another provision of H.R. 3435 which UCPA heartily endorses is that which calls for the Secretary of Education to include a description of the status of special education and related services being rendered to children from birth to five years of age. This provision will enable the Congress and the education community to accurately evaluate the needs of preschoolers with disabilities. Such a report would also enable state education agencies to plan for children who will soon be entering the elementary school system.

Finally, we are pleased that H.R. 3435 allows children from birth through five years of age to be served through the existing Preschool Incentive Grant Program. It is our understanding that this will enable certain states who are currently serving preschool children to begin to serve youngsters under the age of three. This expansion of services clearly enhances the development of many disabled preschoolers. The Subcommittee is to be commended for their insight into the needs of young children with handicapping conditions. All the provisions which we have cited will work together to assure that the needs of these children are adequately met. The importance of these preschool services cannot be overstated. As more handicapped children receive these much-needed services, they will be better prepared to participate in the school system and thus become full functioning adults.

TRANSITIONAL AND POSTSECONDARY SERVICES FOR HANDICAPPED YOUTH

We are pleased that H.R. 3435 contains a section which specifically addresses the needs of handicapped youth. The stated purpose of this section is to "strengthen and coordinate education, training and related services for handicapped youth to assist in the transitional process to postsecondary education, vocational education, or adult services." Disabled youth have a number of unique problems which have not been met. In recent years, UCPA has begun to focus on the needs of teenagers and young adults with cerebral palsy. As we have looked into this area, we have found a number of psyco-social and developmental problems which present substantial barriers to entering adult life. For example, some young persons with disabilities may need assistance in obtaining the skills needed in order to live independently. Other youths may have difficulty relating to their non-disabled peers and may need counseling or simply encouragement in making new friends and moving into the adult world. Families may also need assistance in helping their teenagers achieve independence. These are very real needs and we are confident that this section of H.R. 3435 will begin to address these needs. More important, perhaps, is that these transitional services can be replicated in order to serve other disabled youth. In the coming years we will have an increase in the number of disabled students who have received the benefits of a free appropriate public education, but who may need these transitional services in order to successfully enter adult life. We believe this fact increases the need to focus the Education of the Handicapped Act on these important transitional needs.

H.R. 3435 also expands the current authority under Section 625 of the Act which authorizes postsecondary education programs. This section of the law allows the Secretary to enter into grants and contracts with institutions of higher education and community colleges, vocational and technical schools and any other appropriate agency. Programs funded under this section will develop and operate specially designed model programs for handicapped youth. Historically, this program has been focused on the needs of a single disability group. We are pleased that H.R. 3435 expands this program to serve students with other types of disabling conditions. In addition, we are pleased that H.R. 3435 places an emphasis on the development of model programs rather than the "center" concept which has traditionally been the focus of this program. In light of the current economic conditions, UCPA strongly endorses the promotion of model programs as a cost-effective means of promoting these services.

These transitional and postsecondary programs are both essential to enabling our disabled youth reach their full human potential. Both of these initiatives offer exciting possibilities for a segment of the disabled population which has been largely ignored. We are confident that these provisions will work together to assure that disabled youth are better prepared to enter adult life.

PARENT TRAINING

We are pleased that H.R. 3435 begins to address the existing parent training needs. UCPA was founded by parents of children with cerebral palsy, and parents continue to play an active and important role in our agency. Public Law 94-142 mandated that parents of handicapped children become directly involved in their child's Individualized Education Plan (IEP). The law also gives parents the right to due process if they feel that their child's educational needs are not being met. Both the IEP and parental right to due process are cornerstones of the law. But for parents who do not have experience in developing an IEP or have never had to use due process, these experiences can be very intimidating. Our agency has actively worked with parents to teach them how to utilize these provisions. But we are keenly aware that more parent training must be done in order to assure that parents of handicapped children understand their child's educational needs. Moreover, the parents of these children have many unanswered questions such as, "Will my son or daughter be able to live independently in adult life?" "What types of things should we do in our home which will foster our child's physical and emotional independence?" These are the types of questions which can be answered through a parent training program. We believe that the parent training provisions of H.R. 3435 will offer the flexibility which is needed in order to assure that parents of handicapped children receive this much-needed training. In developing these training programs, we hope the Department will dialogue with other agencies, such as UCPA, who have expertise in working with parents. Such exchange of ideas will enhance the training which is rendered to these parents.

DEFINITION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

H.R. 3435 changes the definition of "special education" by placing the work "educational" in the definition. If this provision is enacted, the language will read as follows:

"The term 'special education' means specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parents or guardians, to meet the unique educational needs of handicapped children, including classroom instruction, instruction in physical education, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions."

We recognize that this change in the definition of "special education" is an attempt to define more clearly the services state and local education agencies must provide to handicapped children. In light of the complexities of our nation's educational system, this change in the definition may be warranted. However, we are concerned that the term "educational" be broadly defined in order to assure that a child receives the educational and related services he or she will need to reach his or her potential. For example, many children with cerebral palsy are intellectually capable, but may have severe physical problems which require related services in order to ameliorate the effects of the handicapping condition.

UCPA is a member of the Consortium for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities Task Force on Education. This task force considered this problem and recommended that the term "educational" be broadly defined to include such factors as academic achievement, physical and social development, adaptive skills, and vocational preparation. UCPA endorses this broad definition because we believe that this will assure that children receive the services they need in order to reach their maximum potential. It is our understanding that the report which accompanies H.R. 3435 will reflect this broad interpretation of the term "educational" and we commend the Subcommittee for this action.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF INTEREST TO UCPA

Several other provisions of H.R. 3435 are of concern to UCPA. For example, Section 607 of the bill will make state educational agencies the recipients of funds for the removal of architectural barriers. Through the enactment of Public Law 98-8, the so-called Emergency Jobs Bill, the Office of Special Education Programs was confronted with the monumental task of distributing $40 million to state and local education agencies within a short period of time. By making the SEA the primary recipient of these funds we believe that this money could be more easily distributed to the local education agencies. This would ease the burden placed on the Office of Special Education Programs and would assure that these funds were spent wisely. However, we must caution the Subcommittee that this provision must not allow states to supplant the efforts which the SEAs and LEAs are currently making toward making our nation's schools accessible to handicapped students. We feel that this money should be viewed as a partnership between the federal government and state and local education agencies whereby these agencies work together to assure that our schools become accessible to all students.

H.R. 3435 significantly expands the evaluation requirements of the Act. A thorough discussion of these provisions is beyond the scope of this testimony. However, H.R. 3435 requires the Secretary to collect data from state and local education agencies concerning the number of children receiving a free appropriate public education by age groups. These groups include children ages three-to-five, six-to-twelve, thirteen-to-seventeen, and eighteen-to-twenty-one. This data will be collected on an annual basis. We do not wish to overburden the state and local education agencies with needless data collection. However, we see a great deal of value in collecting this information, particularly by the age groups which are specified in H.R. 3435. This data would enable state and local education agencies to improve planning for handicapped children on a longitudinal basis. Thus, as children move from one age group to another, state and local education agencies should be able to plan for their needs. This will be especially important for children who will be entering the school system and young adults who will be leaving the school system. We have already expressed our concern that very young children and those disabled students who are leaving the school system have a number of unique needs which have not been met to date. It appears that collecting data by these age groups will enable our nation's educational system to respond to the needs of these students more effectively. UCPA endorses the collection of this data by the specified age groups.

H.R. 3435 eliminates the current provision in the Act which requires states to report the number of children who are not receiving a free appropriate public education. Instead, the bill requires state to report the number of children "in need of improved services and the type of services and programs in need of improvement."

With the implementation of Public Law 94-142, many children who were heretofore excluded from the public school system are not receiving some type of special education services. However, UCPA consults with parents regularly who feel that their children are not receiving appropriate special education and related services. It appears that the provisions of H.R. 3435 will help the educational system and agencies like UCPA focus on areas of special education which need improvement. Thus, we are pleased to endorse this section of H.R. 3435.

We appreciate the opportunity to submit this testimony regarding the Education of the Handicapped Act. We look forward to working with the House Subcommittee on Select Education to improve the quality of special education and related services which are rendered to our nation's handicapped children.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF FREDERICK J. WEINTRAUB, ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN, RESTON, VA.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Select Subcommittee on Education, The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) is pleased to have this opportunity to offer its comments on important issues concerning (H.R. 3435) the reauthorization of the Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA). The Council for Exceptional Children is a national association of 50,000 special education professionals and others concerned with the education of handicapped and gifted and talented children and youth.

Mr. Chairman, while Public Law 94-142 is Part B of EHA, it is our understanding that since it's authorization does not expire, it is not under consideration by the subcommittee during this EHA reauthorization process. CEC's comments will therefore be limited to the remaining portions of the EHA.

Since the Congress created the EHA in 1966, the Act has been the foundation of the federal role in special education, providing the impetus for all manner of research, demonstration and personnel support. The Act originally provided for grants to states (later to become Public Law 94-142), research and personnel preparation, and also mandated the establishment of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) in the U.S. Office of Education (USOE). During the remainder of the 1960's the Congress continued to expand the federal role in special education by amending EHA and adding programs such as regional resource centers, centers for deaf-blind children, instructional media, teacher recruitment, early childhood models, and programs for children with specific learning disabilities.

EHA will, of course, always have an important role in supporting the mission of Public Law 94-142, but, aside from Public Law 94-142 we believe that the EHA has an ongoing mission to continue to improve over time, quality of instruction for exceptional children. That vital mission existed before the enactment of Public Law 94-142, and that mission remains just as vital today.

The EHA has played a significant role over the past two decades in expanding and improving special educational services to handicapped children. In fact, as we review the existing authorities, we are impressed with the continued usefulness and timeliness of most of the provisions of the EHA. We do, however, believe that it is necessary to examine areas of need in the field of special education and to strengthen the EHA based upon that assessment. The recommendations which we make in this statement are based upon that selective search for areas where the statutes should be strengthened. The fact that we do not discuss certain programs or aspects of the statutes does not indicate a lack of concern or support for them. Further, the order of our presentation of issues follows the order in which items appear in the existing EHA designation.

DEFINITION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

The Council for Exceptional Children endorses the provision in H.R. 3435 establishing the term "behaviorally disordered" as the designation for children who are handicapped by virtue of their behavior. The current definition of "handicapped children" uses the terminology "seriously emotionally disturbed" which relies heavily on inferences about internal emotional phenomena. This reflects a conceptualization of mental illness that is at least 20 years old. More current diagnostic classifications stress the description of problem behavior rather than the immediate interpretation of observed behavior as indicative of inner pathology. A new definition that would focus efforts on the description of problem behaviors as they relate to the tasks encountered by students in educational situations would be helpful to the professionals assessing children and developing special educational programs and the children and their families.

DEFINITION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

Section 602(16) of Part A defines special education as it applies to all programs supported by or operated under EHA. "The term 'special education' means specifically designed instruction, at no cost to parents or guardians, to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child, including classroom instruction, instruction in physical education, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions."

We believe that the term "unique needs" has been too broadly interpreted to apply to child needs far beyond those of an educational nature. We therefore concur with the provision in H.R. 3435 adding the word "educational" between "unique" and "needs" in the definition, thus more clearly setting forth that the purpose of special education is to meet the educational needs of handicapped children. In that vein, we would also refer you to the Report from the Commission on the Financing of a Free and Appropriate Education for Special Needs Children (March, 1983), which contains useful discussion on the issue of clarifying that which is and is not educational. We would request, however, that report language accompany this provision to clarify that the committee does not intend to limit the scope of what constitutes an education for handicapped children.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS (SEP) STRUCTURE

The Congress has long maintained a deep concern that the agency administering special education programs:

(1) Have sufficient administrative authority and visibility.

(2) Be the primary agency to speak nationally on the educational needs of exceptional children and youth.

(3) Have sufficient staff to carry out its responsibilities. In Public Law 91-230, enacted on April 13, 1970, and Public Law 93-380, enacted on August 21, 1974, the Congress very precisely required that the then Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) be headed by a Deputy Commissioner of Education appointed by the U.S. Commissioner of Education who was to report directly to the Commissioner.

A similar concern that top bureaucratic rank be guaranteed was demonstrated when the Congress created a separate Department of Education on October 17, 1979. At that time the Congress authorized an Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, to be headed by an Assistant Secretary. This Assistant Secretary, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, reports directly to the Secretary of Education.

CEC was deeply involved in the realization of an independent Department of Education, the joining administratively of special education and rehabilitation services, and the designation of an Assistant Secretary at the top line of the bureaucratic hierarchy. It was everyone's understanding among the various parties involved in the creation of the Department that the then BEH, now Special Education Programs (SEP), would have equal standing, directly under the Assistant Secretary, with the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) and the National Institute for Handicapped Research (NIHR).

We agree with the provision in H.R. 3435 rewriting EHA section 603 to conform to the statutes authorizing the Department of Education. This provision would require:

(1) That there will be a principal agency for administering and carrying out programs and projects relating to the education and training of the handicapped.

(2) That such principal agency shall be headed by a Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Education appointed by the Secretary of Education.

(3) That such Deputy Assistant Secretary shall report directly to the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

(4) That there be six positions for persons to assist the Department Assistant Secretary carry out his duties including the position of Deputy Director.

Such requirements are nothing more than an updating of the thrust of the original EHA language in light of the statutes creating the Department of Education, and will serve to erase any potential future doubt as to the status of the agency responsible for special education programs. Bureaucratic structures in our age are critical reflections of Congressional policy, and cannot be left to chance. We would also urge the committee to include in its report the intent that the three branches of OSERS function on a co-equal basis.

We also request that the statute specify that SEP have administrative and planning responsibility for federal activities on behalf of gifted and talented children and youth. This responsibility previously resided with BEH and SEP. While there is presently not a program for the gifted and talented to administer, we urge that SEP

be charged with overall program responsibility. We will discuss our rationale and other proposals for the gifted and talented later in our statement.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, in 1979, under the aegis of Public Law 91-230, the Congress created a National Advisory Committee on Handiapped Children (section 604, EHA). That committee functioned until its statutory termination on October 1, 1977.

CEC has not historically been an enthusiastic supporter of national advisory committees as a general proposition. We do recognize, however, that the advisory which functioned from 1970 to 1977 offered valuable insights and data which contributed significantly toward the important provisions to move the Nation forward toward full and appropriate educational opportunity for handicapped children. Our point is that at times national advisories, given a specific charge, given precise reporting time lines, and, most importantly, given the requirement that their findings and recommendations shall be transmitted to the Congress, can make a useful contribution toward informing and sensitizing the public in a particular area of national concern.

When the EHA was last reauthorized in 1977, a general effort was underway primarily from the new Carter Administration but with the cooperation of the Congress to eliminate as many national advisory committees as could be reasonably justified. In that spirit, while the statute authorizing a national advisory was retained in the 1977 EHA reauthorization, one short sentence was added at the end of that authority, "The Advisory Committee shall continue to exist until October 1, 1977." CEC did not see sufficient reason to quarrel with that termination.

However, as we struggle to maintain and promote compliance under Public Law 94-142 in the 1980's and 1990's, and at the same time enhance the quality of special education for each and every exceptional child during the same period, we feel that it would be valuable to reconstitute a national advisory committee. Many have been lately suggesting on and off Capitol Hill, that a special commission should be created to further analyze regulatory issues in federal special education law. We are not certain that such a commission is necessary. On the other hand, the provision in H.R. 3435 which provides for the reinstatement of an advisory committee which is already on the books, an advisory which could investigate and report on a number of issues before us at this time—whether the provision of related services, the achievement of qualified instructional personnel, the application of new technology, the provision of services from birth through five and 14 through 21, to name a few—could indeed be helpful. We would urge that H.R. 3435 be amended to change the proposed National Advisory Committee on Education of Handicapped Children to the National Advisory Committee on Special Education to encompass the full scope of authorities and functions under the Act.

Some would wonder if the existing National Council on the Handicapped (NCH) does not already serve this purpose. Our answer is: no. It was clearly understood from inception that this council would advise in matters primarily relating to the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) and the National Institute for Handicapped Research (NIHR). The general lack of special education expertise on that council reflects this intent. Moreover, to add special education to the responsibilities of this Council would be to give it more than it could reasonably handle.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

We strongly endorse the provision in H.R. 3435 to improve the federal effort to provide early childhood services for handicapped children from birth through 5 years of age with specific reference to EHA section 619, the Preschool Incentive Grant Program, and section 623, the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program.

For some time it has been postulated that providing the preschool handicapped child early intervention services during this period of rapid learning and development would increase the possibility of lessening the effects of the handicapped. The research studies of the past decade confirm this hypothesis. Preschool intervention for handicapped children appears to:

(1) Increase intelligence in some children.

(2) Produce substantial gains in motor development, language, emotional stability, cognitive abilities and self-help skills.

(3) Prevent the development of secondary handicapping conditions.

(4) Reduce family stress.

(5) Reduce child abuse.

(6) Increase family income potential.

(7) Reduce societal dependency and institutionalization.

(8) Reduce by up to 50 percent the need for special class placement at school age.

(9) Be cost beneficial by as much as 236 percent.

It is clear that preschool services for handicapped children are essential for handicapped children, their families, our schools and our society.

State education agencies (SEA) reported that in 1982, 227,801, 3-5 year old preschool handicapped children received special education services. The National Center for Educational Statistics estimates that in 1982 there were approximately 10,182,800 children age 3-5. Thus 2.2 percent of the 3-5 population received special education services. It should be noted that Head Start reported that they served 41,339 handicapped children. However, we have no data on how many of the Head Start children are or are not in the SEA reported count. A highly conservative estimate of the percentage of the preschool population requiring special education services is 5 percent. Thus we are presently serving, by liberal estimate only, 50 percent of handicapped children ages 3-5 in need of special education.

The National Foundation-March of Dimes reported that more than 250,000 infants are born each year with birth defects that may lead to handicapping conditions. Another 50,000 infants are born premature and thus with substantial odds of becoming handicapped. While some progress is being made in serving the birth to three handicapped population, estimated conservatively to be over 500,000 children, no data exists on how many are being served. Sample studies suggest the number is minimal.

The Education of the Handicapped Act contains two major preschool components. The oldest is section 623, the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP). The primary purpose of the program has been to encourage the establishment of new effective early education services for handicapped children throughout the states and territories through supporting demonstration and outreach projects and technical assistance. A recent comprehensive evaluation of the program was conducted by Roy Littlejohn Associates, Inc. They reported that:

(1) Projects serving 21,000 handicapped children exist in every state and in several territories, in urban as well as rural areas.

(2) More than 30,600 children have been served in continuation projects at no cost to the HCEEP.

(3) A total of 2,157 replications were identified; 1,991 as a result of outreach activities and 166 from projects in the demonstration phase serving over 100,000 children.

(4) Replication programs are known to have served 107,850 children.

(5) For each child served directly in the demonstration projects, 6.4 children received services through continuation of demonstration projects and through replication of projects.

(6) For every HCEEP dollar expended in programming, $18.37 has been generated in programming for children and their families.

(7) Fifty-five percent of the children who leave HCEEP demonstration projects are placed in integrated settings with non-handicapped children which is less expensive than more specialized placements.

(8) Sixty-seven percent of the children who leave HCEEP demonstration projects perform in the average and above average range in relation to their peers, according to staff of the regular and special education programs to which they graduate.

(9) Eighty percent of the 280 projects are still continuing to serve children independent of HCEEP funding.

(10) Extensive amounts of training have been requested and provided to personnel of other agencies.

(11) More than 3,000 products have been developed by HCEEP projects and widely disseminated, many through commercial publishers.

The report concludes: "The accomplishments of the HCEEP projects as shown by the survey results are greater and more varied than for any other documented education program we have been able to identify."

The second preschool component of EHA is the Preschool Incentive Grant Program, section 619. Because the Congress would not fully mandate services to handicapped children age 3-5 in Public Law 94-142, it established a financial incentive. For each 3-5 year old handicapped child served, a state would receive an additional $300. However, because of limited actual appropriations, 5states are only receiving approximately $110 per child. For states already committed to serving these children the funds are of great assistance, but for states with little or no commitment the incentive is not an incentive at its present level of funding.

A few additional observations:

(1) Since 1980, there has been a 2 percent decline in the number of 3-5 year old handicapped children being served.

(2) Fewer states mandate preschool services today than at the time of passage of Public Law 94-142.

(3) Reductions in funding for health and social service programs is impairing preschool services particularly for the birth to three population.

The Council for Exceptional Children would like to recommend that:

(1) The Congress fully fund the preschool incentive.

(2) That states be permitted to count for reimbursement handicapped children from birth.

(3) That the Public Law 94-142 mandates be extended to handicapped children from birth on a phased in basis.

However, we realize that these recommendations are probably not politically or economically realistic at this time. We therefore endorse the more modest, but nonetheless valuable, amendments contained in H.R. 3435:

(1) To amend the preschool incentive (section 619) to permit states to utilize the funds to serve preschool handicapped children from birth to 5. Present law limits usage to children ages three through five.

(2) To amend the HCEEP program (section 623) to add a new state planning and implementation authority in the area of early childhood. However, we would recommend that federal grants be made available to state education agencies rather than the provision in H.R. 3435 that any state agency may apply. This, we believe, would provide for greater accountability and continuity.

REGIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The Council is increasingly concerned that more concrete progress needs to be made toward meeting the continuing educational needs of exceptional persons beyond completion of a traditional elementary and secondary education. It is recognized that some exceptional persons will still require specially designed basic education beyond the age limits usually established for public education. Some states have extended the age ranges for some exceptional persons. However, little attention has been given to the role of special education in the education systems serving adults. Exceptional persons have lifelong learning or continuing education needs, as do all adults, beyond basic elementary and secondary education. Increasingly, communities are providing such opportunities to the general public, with apparently minimal regard for the special educational needs of exceptional persons. Moreover, the whole issue of effective transfer into the "world of work" still requires comprehensive national attention and action.

Beyond the EHA, CEC continues to work to establish a meaningful policy base on behalf of handicapped Americans in the following federal activities: vocational educaiton; adult education; career education and lifelong learning; continuing education; and CETA, Youth Partnership, and other job training programs.

With respect to EHA, we endorse the proposed amendments to section 625, Regional Postsecondary Education Programs, contained in H.R. 3435 to provide for an enhanced model authority for programming in all areas of postsecondary education.

PERSONNEL PREPARATION

Part D of EHA, which provides support to institutions of higher education, state and local education agencies and other institutions and agencies for the purpose of preparing personnel for the education of handicapped children, is the oldest EHA authority (1958) and perhaps the program having the most significant impact on advancing and improving services of any of the EHA authorities. Twenty-five years ago the Congress recognized, as we do today, that the key to effective services for handicapped children is to develop and maintain an adequate and well prepared cadre of special education personnel. The majority of the personnel in the field of special education, from classroom teachers to administrators to university personnel, were educated in programs supported under Part D. A recent study in Illinois found that 87 percent of the graduates of special education teacher preparation programs in Illinois came from programs supported under Part D.

Perhaps the greatest challenge and test of Part D came following the passage of Public Law 94-142, and the commensurate need for significantly increased numbers of special education personnel. In the three school years from 1976-77 to 1979-80 the number of special educators employed increased by 43,000. Since it is estimated that the annual attrition rate in special education is 12 percent, as compared to 6 percent overall in education, the achievement is even more impressive.

Despite this progress, the Department of Education reported that in school year 1979-80 there were 3,200 vacant special education positions nationwide affecting an estimated 58,000 handicapped students. The Department of Education also reported

an estimated shortfall of 8,864 prepared personnel in 1981-82. Despite the evidence that Part D significantly contributes to meeting the personnel needs of special education and the evidence that severe shortages still exist and will continue to exist, this program has suffered more from Administration budget reductions and policy fluctuations than almost any other.

We believe that recent actions by the Congress to restore some of the lost funds and new regulations by the Administration will provide the firm footing this program needs if it is to remain effective. We believe the rewriting of Part D contained in H.R. 3435 reflects the direction this program needs for the future.

RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION

Research is the second oldest federal special education authority, coming a few years after the initiation of personnel development programs. With respect to the federal role in special education research, we are reminded of the criteria employed by the Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on the Handicapped, Senator Lowell Weicker, to determine whether the federal government should be involved in a specific activity. If the free market private sector will do the job, fine; keep government out. If the private sector will not do the job, then state and local government should become involved. If state and local government will not assume responsibility, then the federal government should become involved. Education research is an excellent example of an activity which has historically required sustained federal support.

If special education is to serve children well, then it can be argued that the life blood of successful education is twofold: having trained professionals, and having the capacity to do the job. "Having the capacity" is directly related to the level of investment in research.

Mr. Chairman, in the years immediately following the enactment of Public Law 94-142, much of the resource available under the research authority of Part E of the EHA was directed toward implementation and evaluation of the implementation of that law. We would not quarrel with that emphasis during the first years of Public Law 94-142, but we urge the Congress to make clear that the essential and overriding mission under Part E should be intensive applied research toward improvement of the quality of instruction of all exceptional children. The provision in H.R. 3435 will focus Part E research on the continuing improvement of special education in the areas of methodology of instruction, instructional environment, and curriculum.

We also agree that there is a critical importance to utilizing the Part E authority toward the continuing application of technology in special education instruction. Many examples may be cited on the potential of technology, but may we simply observe that, from 1980 to 1982, the number of microcomputers available in the schools for instructional purposes doubled. The increase is likely to be even higher in 1983 and 1984.

H.R. 3435 clarifies that Part E is the one authority in the EHA which may allow for model demonstration programs on a flexible basis, that is, not specifically targeted as elsewhere in the EHA on a specific group of children, i.e., early childhood education and the severely handicapped. Two target areas which provide examples of the urgent need to develop model demonstration activities may be found in the education of seriously emotionally disturbed children and in the area of secondary-transition education for all handicapped children.

With respect to secondary education, if high school is a momentous time for all of our nation's youth, the challenges that must be overcome for handicapped youth are truly staggering. This is the time when the basics learned in elementary education must come together to produce personal fulfillment, independent living, postsecondary education potentials, and realistic opportunity in the world of work. All of this occurs in the midst of an ever changing job market. Further, all of this occurs in the midst of the normal transitions of adolescence, compounded by the individual learning difficulties of one requiring continuing special education.

Thus far, model demonstrations have been traditionally in the elementary area. Secondary special education cannot be dealt with simply by an extension of elementary special education or by minor changes in existing secondary curricula. It is increasingly apparent that secondary level special education requires significant alteration in instructional methodology, organization, and structure. We urgently require a serious national investment in the preparation, testing, and replication of proven models in secondary special education. We agree with the intent in H.R. 3435 to focus attention on secondary education. We question, however, whether a separate authority is necessary. We believe that the need could be met under the Part E authority.

THE EDUCATION OF GIFTED AND TALENTED CHILDREN

As the members of this subcommittee know, The Council for Exceptional Children also speaks on behalf of gifted and talented children and their special educational needs.

The history of recent federal activity in this area has not been encouraging. On October 6, 1971, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Sidney Marland, submitted his now much quoted nationwide assessment regarding the status of gifted and talented education to the Congress. One of the clear messages of the Marland Report was: efforts to stimulate the development of gifted and talented programs through the use of unspecified federal appropriations were not benefiting gifted and talented children in any significant way. Partly as a consequence of that evidence, the Congress created in 1974, and later expanded in 1978—with the support of CEC—a modest but important program of federal support specifically for gifted and talented children. That program included a state and local support component; demonstration, research, and clearinghouse authority; and designation of a U.S. Office for Gifted and Talented Children, which was housed in the then Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

But all of this was swept away and the evidence of the Marland Report was disregarded with enactment of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA). The block grant proponents were given their day, and the gifted and talented program dissolved into that education block grant (Chapter 2, ECIA) along with most of the rest of the authorities under the prior Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

What limited information is now available on the actual use of the block grant by the states and local school districts with respect to gifted and talented education is not encouraging. The National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE) recently reported that only five states specified that a percentage of the funds going to local education agencies for educating high cost special needs children include gifted and talented children. The percentage varied from 10 percent in Alabama, Delaware, and Washington to 5 percent in New Jersey and 4 percent in Oregon. Even if the local districts adhered to these state-level prescriptions (whether they are required by law to do so is in doubt), this would represent only .5 percent of the $437 million distributed to the states under the education block grant in fiscal 1982.

Only slightly more encouraging news comes from a recent preliminary report to the U.S. Department of Education. Nineteen of the 24 states reporting indicated that their localities are utilizing the block grant for educational support for the gifted and talented, representing a total of $3.8 million and representing a percentage of 3.03 of the total Chapter 2 allocation. Nineteen states means less than half of the states, and when one factors in the territories, it could be argued that barely over one-third of all jurisdictions report allocations for gifted and talented education. It is also worth noting that the prior, targeted program was operating at $6 million in actual appropriations before being liquidated.

We do not mean to dismiss potential for gifted and talented children under the block grant. But the block grant approach does not constitute federal leadership at a time when the experts are saying that it is essential that the federal government return to its role as a catalytic agent. In fact, the history of efforts for gifted and talented children presents convincing evidence that the states and localities follow the lead of national trends and federal priorities. This view was recently reiterated by the President's Commission on Excellence in Education that called for the federal government to assume the leadership in advancing the needs of gifted and talented children.

Such a role should mean vigorous federal activity in the following areas: professional training, inservice training, demonstration programs, innovation and development through research, and state leadership expansion and training.

The Council for Exceptional Children remains firmly committed to the inclusion of gifted and talented children within the exceptional child concept. It should be recalled that historically the majority of special educators have used the term exceptional in referring to all children with special needs (both gifted as well as handicapped) and likewise, as practitioners, have always perceived themselves as belonging to a profession committed to the education of all exceptional children. In addition, there are presently 28 states that administratively house their gifted and talented educational programs within their state-level Special or Exceptional Education Units or Divisions.

We believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is time for the Congress to signal again a priority concern for gifted and talented children and their special educational needs. We

have a number of recommendations to again establish a federal leadership role in this area, but at this time we make the following specific recommendations:

(1) That Special Education Programs within the Department of Education be required to include gifted and talented children as a priority population.

(2) That, wherever appropriate, the Secretary-discretionary programs (EHA, Parts C through F) which are administered by the current SEP be expanded to include gifted and talented children as an eligible target population along with handicapped children.

(3) That a reconstituted National Advisory Committee on Special Education include among its responsibilities issues relevant to the education of gifted and talented children.

Mr. Chairman, without going into great detail at this time, we would like to observe again that the proposed enlargement of the exceptional child base is by no means revolutionary. Many states, including Pennsylvania, have such a base, either in statutes or in practice. And again, in the special education profession there exists a long established common base of expertise with respect to the whole spectrum of exceptionality, handicapped children and gifted and talented children.

In conclusion, may we say how pleased we are with the progressive directions being taken in the reauthorization of the EHA by both this subcommittee and by the corresponding subcommittee of the Senate. Finally, may we again thank you for this opportunity to offer written comment for the public record. We stand prepared to make the full resources of The Council for Exceptional Children available to this subcommittee as it fulfills its legislative charge with respect to reauthorization of the Education of the Handicapped Act.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE CONFERENCE OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS SERVING THE DEAF, INC. (CEASD) AND THE CONVENTION OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF (CAID)

Mr. Chairman, the Conference of Educational Administrators Serving the Deaf, Inc. (CEASD) and The Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf (CAID) very much appreciate this opportunity to submit their views on the reauthorization of discretionary programs under the Education of the Handicapped Act, with regard to Part F, "Instructional Media for the Handicapped," and particularly the Captioned Films and Educational Media for the Handicapped.

First, let me begin by making a very important distinction regarding the Captioned Films and Instructional Media Progam. It should not be considered a discretionary program. We say this because it is not a program for which the need will go away. This is a basic service program and the prime source of communication and education for deaf persons—children and adults. Most of the other discretionary programs authorized under the Education of the Handicapped Act are either research or demonstration programs, limited to a few centers or programs.

In fact, the Captioned Films and Instructional Media Program was indefinitely authorized until the enactment of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981. For 25 years, since the program was originally established in 1958 as the Captioned Films for the Deaf Programs, the Federal government has demonstrated their support for these important services for the deaf. Although the program was expanded in 1968 to include all handicapped persons, deaf persons have been the primary focus of this program—a focus which we hope the Congress will reaffirm during the reauthorization process, as deaf persons continue to need the full impact of this program. This is the only program funded by the Federal government which provides direct services to the broad range of deaf persons, from children to adults.

Second, let me specifically emphasize that the Captioned Films and Educational Media Program plays a critical role in addressing the cultural and educational needs of deaf children and adults. By providing for the development of educational and general interest media which addresses the unique communication needs of the deaf; the production and distribution of captioned films; and the training of persons in the use of such media, the Captioned Films and Educational Media Program allows deaf persons to enter the mainstream of American life.

In order to comprehend the importance of this program, one must recognize that deafness is indeed a severe disability, which poses very difficult educational barriers, and barriers to enabling deaf persons to participate in, understand, and communicate with the world in which they live. The services provided through the Captioned Films Program are therefore essential to bringing deaf persons into the cultural mainstream of our society, and to their educational development and enrichment.

Mr. Chairman, sustained federal support for the Captioned Films and Educational Media Program is essential if the unique communication needs of the deaf are to be addressed. There is no other source for these services. They are unlikely to be addressed at other levels of our society due to the relatively few numbers of deaf individuals, and their thin geographic dispersion, which makes the costs of highly specialized media services and products, the stimulation of innovative media applications, and the exploration of technological advancements in this regard, not commercially viable in the private sector, and inefficient on a state-by-state basis. There is, therefore, a continuing need for centralized media services and service delivery for the deaf population.

The importance that deaf individuals attach to these services is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the deaf population participates in the cost of the program. The deaf persons who organize groups to borrow and watch captioned films also purchase projectors and pay return postage costs in order to use the films. No charge can be made for admission to viewing a captioned film loaned under this government program. The agencies/schools which operate the 58 educational captioned film depositories absorb as much as 80 percent of the cost of circulation of educational captioned films. Deaf persons who wish to benefit from closed-captioned television must make an investment of more than $200 for a television decoder. Approximately 70,000 decoders have been purchased.

Unfortunately, media related services currently available to the field of deafness represent a reduction in services, in spite of the demand for such services. While over 1,300 educational films have been selected for captioning, this represents only a small fraction of the educational films available to the public at large. More than 150,000 film loans are processed each year by and through 58 cooperating film depositories. In the aggregate, these serve more than 3,000 accounts in schools and programs. In a recent year, the number of accounts increased by more than 20 percent. The Captioned Films and Educational Media Program has demonstrated that it provides services that deaf persons and educators of the deaf need and want.

Other accomplishments of the program include the development of a collection of more than 1,000 general interest films which have been captioned to made them accessible to deaf persons. More than 100,000 film loans are made each year from a centralized distribution center to more than 7,000 groups of deaf adults. The number of registered groups has increased each year notwithstanding the introduction of broadcast captioned programming on television. In addition, the program has developed Line 21 closed-captioned TV technology largely due to federal program support. A significant amount of captioned programming is being make accessible to deaf persons through broadcast television.

During the 97th Congress, the House Subcommittee on Select Education, and subsequently the House Committee on Education and Labor, reported legislation (H.R. 6820) which would have established the Captioned Films and Educational Media Program as an indefinite, independent authorization within the Department of Education budget, thereby affirming, according to House Report 97-950 to H.R. 6820, that ". . . the distribution of captioned media and other adapted materials has been and should continue to be a legitimate federal responsibility," and ". . . as something different from the traditional discretionary programs."

While this specific statutory change is not reflected in the current reauthorization measure, H.R. 3435, CEASD would urge the Subcommittee to reaffirm in Report language (1) the importance of this program to meeting the unique communication needs of the deaf; (2) the continuing need for centralized federal support for the program; (3) the recognition that this program is indeed different from the traditional discretionary programs; and (4) the urgent need of the deaf population, in particular, for these services.

Given the limited funding available to this program, the lack of other avenues for providing such media materials and services to the deaf, the increased numbers of deaf persons due to the rubella epidemic of 1963-65, and the fundamental relationship of these media services to the specific communication deficit of the severely hearing impaired, an atmosphere of stability and growth is imperative to the program and the individuals it is intended to benefit. Without this program, deaf individuals would be substantially isolated from the broader society and its values. The access that has been provided through this program is still far short of what is needed, and of what is available to the general public. CEASD therefore respectfully urges the Subcommittee to reaffirm Congressional recognition of the importance of the Captioned Films Program and related media services to the deaf individual.

Thank you for this opportunity to present our views.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN SPEECH-LANGUAGE-HEARING ASSOCIATION

The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association is pleased to submit its views and recommendations concerning reauthorization of the discretionary programs under the Education of the Handicapped Act. The House Subcommittee on Select Education has undertaken a careful review of these programs and we appreciate having been afforded the opportunity to participate in development of the "Education of the Handicapped Amendments of 1984."

Since implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act over a decade ago, we have been seen tremendous growth in both the quantity and quality of education of the handicapped programs and services. Much of this improvement can be traced directly to the activities initiated and completed under the discretionary programs that are part of the Act. Examples include the following:

Demonstration projects for early childhood and severely handicapped. These projects provide information, materials and services to thousands of handicapped children, teachers, parents and program administrators. Without projects such as these, there would have been little incentive to provide needed services to the preschool and severely handicapped population.

As the need for quality special education was realized, there was an increased demand for qualified special educators. EHA funds available for personnel development ensured that there would be a supply of qualified personnel available to implement special education and related service programs. Unfortunately, the demand has always exceeded the supply.

To ensure that the programs, materials, and technology used in special education are up-to-date and effective, EHA provides funds for innovation and development. The projects encourage research to ensure that the most cost-effective methods and materials are available for use with handicapped children.

These few examples show in a small way the importance of EHA programs to the lives of handicapped children, their parents and teachers. Therefore, ASHA believes it is important to continue the education of the handicapped discretionary programs and that authorized funding be placed at a level that will ensure continued growth and improvement of Education of the Handicapped Act programs.

Definitions (pt. A, sec. 602 of the act)

The proposed changes are largely of a technical nature but will have the important effect of updating definitions which are central to proper interpretation of congressional intent and implementation of the Act. We strongly endorse the addition of the term "or language" after speech. "Handicapped children" (Section 602(1)) will now be defined to include: "Mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech or language impaired, visually handicapped, behaviorally disordered, orthopedically impaired, or other health impaired children, or children with specific learning disabilities, who by reason thereof require special education and related services."

During the past decade there has been a greater awareness and identification of children and youth with language impairment. A 1981 study of speech-language pathologists employed in the schools found that 46.7 percent of the cases served were language impaired children.[1] Although this number includes children with other handicaps, speech-language pathologists and identifying a greater number who have a primary handicap of language impairment. Because professionals throughout the nation are identifying children who are language impaired, many state and local education agencies use the category "speech or language impaired" as a way of accurately identifying communicatively handicapped children and youth.

The term "speech or language impaired" makes it clear that children and youth with language disorders are to be covered under the Act and provides a visible category in which they can be idenitified. The proposed change also brings the law into line with the Public Law 94-142 regulations that refer to "the identification of children with speech or language disorders."

We are concerned with the addition of the term "educational" to the phrase "to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child" in the definition of "special education." While we concur with the argument that this is an "education" act, there is the danger that the term "educational" will be narrowly defined to mean "academic."

[1] "The Speech-Language Pathologist in the Public School: A Current Profile," Governmental Affairs Review, American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, vol. 2, No. 2 (July 1981), 77-81. This figure was verified by an American Speech-Language-Hearing Association survey done in 1982.

In actual practice, the term "educational" is often used by state and local education agencies synonomusly with the term "academic achievement." Therefore, some state and local education agencies have indicated that to be eligible for special education a child must have a handicap and problems in academic achievement—meaning reading, writing, mathematics or other academic subjects. For example, some students who are severe stutterers or who have voice disorders but who do well academically are not eligible for service because they do not have "educational" (i.e., academic achievement) problems.

ASHA believes this violates the intent of the Education of the Handicapped Act and is discriminatory against individuals who have handicaps but are doing well academically. The term "educational" should refer not only to the child's ability to achieve academically, but also to the ability to develop communicatively, socially, physically and emotionally. To include the term "educational" without a concomitant definition of what it means will only perpetuate confusion. If left undefined, the term "educational" might be used by state and local education agencies to deny many necessary related services (which they might consider health rather than educational in nature), such as audiology, physical therapy and occupational therapy. This might result in noncompliance with the requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 concerning the provision of appropriate educational services to handicapped children. "An appropriate education . . . consist(s) of education in regular classes, education in regular classes with the use of supplementary services, or special education and (such) related services as developmental, corrective, and other supportive services . . ." (42 FR 22690, Section 84.33(b)).

In order to clarify the meaning of this term and to continue coverage of "all handicapped children," we recommend that Section 602(16) be amended as follows:

"The term 'special education' means specially designed instruction, at no cost to parents or guardians, to meet the unique educational needs of a handicapped child, including classroom instruction, instruction in physical education, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions. Unique educational needs include academic, social, emotional, communicative and physical needs."

Similar language already exists elsewhere in the Act. Section 623 (Early Childhood Education) provides "for activities and services designed to (1) facilitate the intellectual, emotional, physical, mental, social, and language development of such children . . .". Also, the new section on transitional services includes among potential grant recipients "specially designed programs to provide more effective secondary school instruction in interaction of handicapped youth with non-disabled students, development of positive self-image, improvement of social, communication, and independent living skills . . ." (Section 626(a)(8)) and "demonstration and model programs which offer promise of improving secondary school education for handicapped youth including increasing successful participation in academic, social, cultural, athletic, community, and other aspects of the total school program . . ." (Section 626(a)(9). The proposed modification of the amendment to section 602(16) would therefore be kept consistent with the rest of the statute.

Another change that we believe is necessary in updating the Act is in the definition of "specific learning disabilities." In response to concern among professionals and parents with the inappropriateness of the existing definition, a study of issues related to the definition of specific learning disabilities was undertaken by the National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (NJCLD). This Committee consists of the following organizations: The Association for Children and Adults with Learning Disabilities, American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, Council for Learning Disabilities—Council for Exceptional Children, Division for Children with Communication Disorders—Council for Exceptional Children, International Reading Association, and The Orton Dyslexia Society, Inc. It is recommended that the definition developed by the NJCLD be used in Section 602(15) of the Act: [2]

"Learning disabilities is a generic term that refers to a heterogeneous group of disorders manifested by significant difficulties in the acquisition and use of listening, speaking, reading, writing, reasoning, or mathematical abilities. These disorders are intrinsic to the individual and presumed to be due to central nervous system dysfunction.

"Even though a learning disability may occur concomitantly with other handicapping conditions (e.g., sensory impairment, mental retardation, social and emotional disturbance) or environmental influences (e.g., cultural differences, insufficient/inappropriate instruction, psychogenic factors), it is not the direct result of those conditions or influences."

---

[2] The full statement is attached as Appendix A.

Evaluation (pt. A, sec. 618)

Various changes and additions are proposed in this section which should have the effect of providing more accurate information about children receiving or needing special education and related services. In particular, greater attention will be focused on the need for improving services (i.e., identifying underserved as contrasted with unserved children, since most of the latter have been and are being accounted for). There is one major gap in the list of new data collection requirements—there is no proposal to collect information on related services. We believe that Congress is in an untenable position in determining the overall funding requirements for education of the handicapped programs when it has no data on the kinds or volume of related services provided handicapped students. Such data would assist members of Congress in making decisions regarding necessary funding for related services as part of the overall education of the handicapped program.

ASHA recommends that data be collected on the related services provided for each handicapping condition. At a minimum, there should be a study to gather such information from a representative sample of states.

In addition, we recommend that the House consider the longitudinal study approved in the Senate-passed bill (S. 1341) which would "sample . . . handicapped students encompassing the full range of handicapping conditions . . . [and examine] their educational progress while in special education and their occupational, educational, and independent living status after graduating from secondary school or otherwise leaving special education." (Section 618(c)(3)(A)).

Preschool incentive grant program (pt. B, sec. 619)

ASHA has testified (Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, October 1980) in support of expanding coverage of handicapped children to include the population below the age of 3, and we are therefore very supportive of the amendment to the Preschool Incentive Grant Program that would bring about this change. Much research had demonstrated that early identification, diagnosis, and treatment of handicapping conditions can significantly reduce the number and severity of handicaps in later life. Efforts to reduce the limiting effects that physical and cognitive impairments have on major life functions permit children to more fully benefit from the educational process.

Besides the development gains derived from early intervention, there are important benefits to the public. Since the provision of special education and related services to infants and preschool children should reduce the number and severity of handicapped conditions, fewer public funds will have to be allocated for these children during their school years and beyond.

Deaf-blind centers (pt. C, sec. 622)

The initial intent of model deaf-blind centers has been met. The centers have provided programming support for those deaf-blind children identified as a result of the rubella epidemic of 1963–65. In the 14 years since funding for this program was initiated, we have seen the full implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Thus, many of the services provided under this program are duplicative of what state and local education agencies are to provide under Public Law 94-142.

We suggest that centers begin a transition from centers providing direct services to centers that provide technical assistance and coordination activities in the area of deaf-blind and severely handicapped children and youth. In the future, consideration should be given to determining how such technical assistance and coordination to state and local education agencies fits with the technical assistance activities of the Regional Resource Centers. Possibly, all technical assistance functions could be taken over by one program.

Early childhood education (pt. C, sec. 623)

Education of preschool handicapped children has proved to be one of the most cost-effective special education programs. The handicapped children's early education program has provided service to thousands of young children through outreach programs and has provided state and local education agencies with models, methods and materials that have facilitated the provision of cost effective services for preschool handicapped children nationwide.

Early education programs are cost effective. In an 18-year study of the High Scope Perry Preschool Program in Ypsilanti, Michigan, the High Scope Education Research Foundation reported that by the end of high school 19 percent of children who had attended preschool had been placed in special education classes compared to 39 percent of those who had not attended. This is a 50 percent reduction in the

need for special education services. The study indicated also that the long-term benefits of preschool outweigh the costs.[3] A public school that invests $3,000 per child for one year of preschool begins to recoup its investment immediately in savings on special education and related services. Early Childhood Education projects serve thousands of young children through outreach programs, demonstration projects, institutes, and technical assistance. Most important, these projects provide information that can be used by school districts nationwide to provide cost effective services for preschool handicapped children.

Increased funding for this program is needed to encourage states to provide programs and services for handicapped children, birth to age 5. We endorse the action of both House and Senate authorizing committees in specifying that this section applies to children from birth to eight years of age. ASHA suggests that part of the funds be used to provide states with planning grants to develop and implement a full service preschool program plan.

ASHA recommends that the handicapped children's early education program be reauthorized at a level of $25 million.

Postsecondary education programs (sec. 625)

Projects funded under this Section have focused primarily on handicapped adults pursuing higher education. This is an important program in that it is the only section of the Act that deals directly with the handicapped adult's efforts to achieve higher education.

Most of the funds authorized for this program have been used to assist deaf individuals. However, the existing statute specifically refers to the full range of handicaps and we recommend that project be expanded to include other groups of handicapped adults in need of higher education and vocational education programs.

ASHA recommends that this Section be reauthorized at a level of $4 million.

Secondary education and transitional services for handicapped youth (sec. 626)

This new section fills a major gap in the universe of programs serving handicapped persons. The program will authorize grants for the purpose of strengthening and coordinating education, training and related services to assist handicapped youth in the transitional process to postsecondary education, continuing education, vocational training, competitive employment, and independent living.

Another stated purpose of the grants is to initiate "collaborative models between educational agencies and adult service agencies, including vocational rehabilitation, mental health, mental retardation, public employment, and employers which facilitate the planning and developing of transitional services for handicapped youth . . ." (Section 626(b)(6)). We believe that coordination among these agencies, and particularly between education and vocational rehabilitation agencies, is essential.

The Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services was established to improve the transition of handicapped individuals from elementary and secondary education to vocational pursuits. We are confident that this new section will be an important means of fulfilling the OSERS mission of assisting handicapped individuals in the transitional period from school to adult employment and independent living.

Training personnel for the education of the handicapped (pt. D, secs. 631 and 632)

The education of the handicapped personnel development program provides support to institutions of higher education and state and local education agencies to ensure an adequate supply of qualified providers of speical education and related services. Funds also have been used to provide special education training for regular educators and for development of innovative training models. Without properly trained, accessible, and sufficient personnel, it is difficult to envision the successful accomplishment of the primary goal of Public Law 94-142. Study after study has shown that the shortage of qualified special education personnel is a critical national problem. For example, in February 1983, 41 state education agencies indicated they had funded but unfilled vacancies for speech-language pathologists. One state reported over 300 vacancies. In an effort to recruit individuals regardless of their qualifications, 10 states that currently require the master's degree as the minimum level of education and training for employment as a speech-language pathologist are considering or have already reduced their certification standards to the bachelor's level. Hence, there is not only an inadequate supply of personnel but also a trend

[3] See Schweinhart, L. J. & Weikart, D. P. "*Young Children Grow Up:* the Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 15." High Scope Educational Research Foundation (1980).

toward less qualified personnel in the public schools. This trend can only lead to poorer services and educational outcomes for handicapped children.

In order to increase the supply of qualified personnel to serve handicapped children, the decline in federal assistance during the past several years must be reversed. ASHA recommends that the authorized level of funding be set at $70 million for the period covered under this reauthorization. Under the expiring Act, funding had been authorized at $95 million in fiscal year 1982. We believe that our recommendation, which is based on actual funding in fiscal year 1979 plus modest incremental increases (five percent) added to cover inflation, is realistic and appropriate.

ASHA supports changes being proposed in Part D of the Act. One change that is purely technical will substitute the term "speech-language pathology" for the outdated term "speech correctionist" in Section 631(1)(1)(A) which lists fields that may receive grant support in preparation of special education personnel. We also are in favor of efforts to inform and train parents regarding the rights and available services for their handicapped children. We think that it is especially important that these efforts be aimed at participatory interaction between parents and professionals in order to further improve educational and related services to children. Finally, ASHA supports the amendment requiring that:

"The Secretary shall ensure that grants awarded to applicant institutions and agencies under this subsection meet state and professionally recognized standards for the training of special education and related service personnel." (sec. 631(a)(2).)

This requirement will help improve the overall quality of personnel trained and should serve as an incentive for those programs that do not now meet state and professional standards to strive for improvement. By providing funds only to programs that meet designated standards, the training of highly qualified professionals will be enhanced. As a means of implementing this new requirement, we recommend that funding be given to those programs that have received accreditation from agencies recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and/or the Department of Education.

Recruitment and information (pt. D, sec. 633)

ASHA supports the expansion of this section and the development of a national clearinghouse on the education of the handicapped. We believe that support for referral services, parent training and information programs, and programs to encourage students and professional personnel to seek careers in education of the handicapped are laudable objectives.

Innovation and development (pt. E)

We also support the expansion of research and related activities under Part E. This Part provides research and development funds needed to develop new products, programs and services that will improve the quality of education received by the handicapped. Research projects funded typically have national significance and are based on national needs. If adequate and appropriate services are going to be provided, now and in the future, it is necessary to continue to research and disseminate innovative and cost-effective techniques and materials related to education of the handicapped programs.

The proposed changes, taken as a whole, should significantly improve the quality and utility of education of the handicapped research. In particular, we think it is appropriate that there will be a coordination of research priorities and activities between this program and the National Institute of Handicapped Research. Also, we think that it is appropriate to require that panels of experts convened for purposes of evaluating discretionary programs be composed of special educators, handicapped individuals, and parents of the handicapped.

We recommend three additional areas in which accurate up-to-date information is needed. One area concerns the demonstration of personnel needs among the special education professional disciplines and within geographical locations. The determination of areas of personnel shortages and need is essential to the appropriate allocation of training resources. A second area concerns the identification and compilation of information on other (than education agency) sources of support services for handicapped children (e.g., Medicaid, private health insurance).

Because of decreasing finances, many states are revising their eligibility requirements for handicapped children, and are changing their policies on class size and caseload. As a result, handicapped children who previously were eligible for education of the handicapped services are no longer eligible. Also, as caseloads and class sizes increase, handicapped children may receive services that are not appropriate for their needs. ASHA recommends a study of the impact state policies related to eligibility and caseload/class size have on delivery of special education and related

services. We believe this is important information that will assist in determining the impact of changing state policies on education of handicapped children and youth.

ASHA recommends reauthorization of Part E projects at a level of $25 million.

While Public Law 94-142 and Part B funding ensure the provision of free and appropriate public education for handicapped children, the discretionary programs (Parts C, D and E) provide the infrastructure on which an effective State Grant Program is built. Without adequate provisions and funding to ensure continuing and adequate personnel development, preschool through postsecondary demonstration projects, research, and dissemination of information, the provision of quality education for handicapped children and youth would be difficult, if not impossible.

ASHA appreciates the opportunity to present its views and recommendations for the Subcommittee's consideration. We look forward to continue working with Members and staff as Congress proceeds with the important legislative task of extending and improving the Education of the Handicapped Act.